A. Peter Hayman

Sefer Yeṣira

Edition, Translation and Text-Critical Commentary

Mohr Siebeck

A. Peter Hayman, born 1943; studied Theology at the University of Durham; 1968 PhD in Oriental Languages (School of Oriental Studies, University of Durham); Senior Lecturer in Hebrew and Jewish Studies at the University of Edingburgh.

ISBN 3-16-148381-2
ISSN 0721-8753 (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism)

Die Deutsche Bibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data is available on the Internet at *http://dnb.ddb.de*.

© 2004 by Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, Germany.

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was typeset by Martin Fischer in Tübingen, printed by Gulde-Druck in Tübingen on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier.

Printed in Germany.

Preface

This edition of the text of Sefer Yeṣira has been a long time coming. I first conceived the idea of doing it in the early 1980s when I was reading the text with my students in a course on Jewish Mysticism at the University of Edinburgh. The fundamental research for the book was carried out in 1985 in a visit to the Microfilm Institute of the Jewish National and University Library in Jerusalem, funded by a grant from the British Academy. My initial intention was to produce an edition, translation and both a text-critical commentary and a commentary on the content. In the event it turned out that this was too ambitious a project to be accomplished within one book and, in any case, competing priorities, especially from the pressures of university administration, preventing me from producing more than a series of one-off papers and articles on Sefer Yeṣira. I now plan a series of three books: first, this edition, second, a collected edition of my papers on Sefer Yeṣira, and third, a commentary on the content of the text. This book, therefore, is concerned solely with the text – with the manuscripts, the recensions, the individual readings within the paragraphs. Issues of introduction, date, place of origin, and what the text might mean, will be reserved for the later books, though I have already dealt with many of these in my published papers. Of course, no rigid dividing line can be drawn between these different approaches to a text and, inevitably, I will stray into discussion of the content from time to time, but I wish to stress that this is not my primary purpose in this book.

In 2003 the University of Edinburgh allowed me a complete sabbatical year with relief from all teaching and administrative duties – partly funded by a grant from the British Arts and Humanities Research Board. This gave me, at last, the freedom to concentrate on producing the edition of the text. I am very grateful to both for giving me this opportunity. My thanks are also due to those who, over the years, have kept urging me to produce the book, especially Peter Schäfer and Joseph Dan. I am grateful for the help of Stefan Reif and Philip Alexander in obtaining the AHRB grant. But my deepest thanks are due to Ithamar Gruenwald of the University of Tel Aviv for the many hours we have spent discussing Sefer Yeṣira in his visits to Edinburgh and mine to Jerusalem. I build upon the foundation he laid in his "Preliminary Critical Edition of Sefer Yezira" and his 1973 *REJ* article, "Some Critical Notes on the First Part of Sefer Yezira."

Finally, my thanks are due to the various libraries who have given me permission to publish the manuscripts used in this edition and supplied me with the microfilms and photographs of the manuscripts: the Syndics of Cambridge University Library,

Bibliothèque nationale de France, Leiden University Library, the Bodleian Library, the British Library, the Library of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, the Vatican Library, the Bibliotheca Palatina di Parma, the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, and the Microfilm Institute of the Jewish National and University Library in Jerusalem. Above all am I grateful to three generations of Librarians of New College Library (University of Edinburgh) – John Howard, Murray Simpson and Eileen Dickson, for the unstinting help they have given me in obtaining the research materials I needed to complete this project.

The School of Divinity
New College
University of Edinburgh
December, 2003

Peter Hayman

Contents

Abbreviations ... XI

Introduction ... 1

1. The fluid state of the text of Sefer Yeṣira ... 1
2. Why a new edition of Sefer Yeṣira? ... 3
3. The "original text" of SY or "the earliest recoverable text"? ... 6
4. Editing Jewish texts from the first millennium C.E. ... 9
5. The Manuscripts ... 12
   - 5.1 The Long Recension ... 12
   - 5.2 The Saadyan Recension ... 13
   - 5.3 The Short Recension ... 13
6. The rules of the edition ... 14
7. Abbreviations in the textual apparatus ... 16
8. Notes on the manuscripts ... 16
   - 8.1 The Long Recension ... 16
   - 8.2 The Saadyan Recension ... 18
   - 8.3 The Short Recension ... 20
9. The Chapter and Paragraph Divisions (Appendix II) ... 24
10. The Four Pre-Kabbalistic Commentaries ... 25
    - 10.1 The Commentary of Saadya Gaon ... 26
    - 10.2 The Commentary of Dunash Ibn Tamim ... 29
    - 10.3 The Ḥakhemoni of Shabbetai Donnolo ... 31
    - 10.4 The Commentary of Rabbi Judah ben Barzillai ... 32
11. The Earliest Recoverable Text of Sefer Yeṣira and the Three Recensions ... 33
    - 11.1 The Biblical Material in Sefer Yeṣira ... 34
    - 11.2 The Rabbinic Material ... 34
    - 11.3 Creatio ex Nihilo in Sefer Yeṣira ... 35
    - 11.4 The Astrological Material in Sefer Yeṣira ... 36
    - 11.5 The Kabbalistic Readings and Additions ... 37
    - 11.6 The Commentary Material ... 37
12. The Three Recensions and the Development of the SY Text Tradition ... 39

Appendix I: The attestation of the paragraphs in the manuscripts 43
Appendix II: The order of the paragraphs in the manuscipts 46
Appendix III: The earliest recoverable text of Sefer Yeṣira 49
Appendix IV: The Long Recension additions 52

Edition and Commentary 59

Bibliography 197
Index of sources 203
Index of modern authors 205

Abbreviations

BJRL	Bulletin of the John Rylands Library
EJ	Encyclopaedia Judaica
IOS	Israel Oriental Studies
JA	Jewish Art
JHP	Journal of the History of Philosophy
JNUL	Jewish National and University Library
JQR	Jewish Quarterly Review
JJS	Journal of Jewish Studies
JPSA	Jewish Publication Society of America
JSOT	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament
JSS	Journal of Semitic Studies
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies
MGWJ	Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums
REJ	Revue des Études Juives
RHR	Revue d'Histoire des Religions
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum

Introduction

1. The fluid state of the text of Sefer Yeṣira

Right from the beginning of the emergence of Sefer Yeṣira[1] into the light of day in the early tenth century it was recognized that its text had not been transmitted without errors. Saadya Gaon, the earliest commentator whose text has been preserved,[2] states at the end of his introduction to SY: "we think (it best) to write down each paragraph from it (i.e. SY) completely, then we will explain it because it is not a book which is widely available and not many people have preserved it from suffering changes or alterations."[3] Writing not much later than Saadya in 955/6 C.E., Dunash ben Tamim says: "mais nous avons déja dit qu'il pouvait y avoir dans ce livre des passages altérés que le patriarche Abraham [n'a jamais énoncés], [provenant] des commentaires en hébreu, auxquels des gens ignorants ont ajouté postérieurement un autre commentaire et la vérité se perdait entretemps."[4] The most comprehensive of the early commentaries, written by Judah ben Barzillai frequently quotes different versions of the text and discusses variant readings of which he was aware. Like Dunash he attributes the corruption of the text (almost

---

[1] Henceforth SY.

[2] Written in 931 C.E. See below for more detailed discussion of the early commentaries on SY.

[3] M. Lambert, *Commentaire sur le Séfer Yeṣira ou livre de la creation par le Gaon Saadya de Fayyoum*, 1891, p. 13, trans. p. 29, J.D. Kafach, ספר יצירה השלם עם תרגום ופירוש רבנו סעדיה גאון, 1972, p. 34. Lambert and Kafach's translations of Saadya's Arabic differ at this point. Lambert has: "nous croyons bon de transcrire chaque paragraphe intégralement et ensuite nous l'expliquerons, car ce livre n'est pas un livre répandu et en outre grande nombre de gens ne le comprennent pas; (nous ferons ainsi) afin qu'il n'y entre pas d'altération ou d'erreur ..." Kafach translates: ראיתי לקבוע ממנו הלכה בשלמותו, ואחר כך אתרגמנה, מפני שאינו ספר המצוי הרבה, ולא רבים מבני אדם שמרו עליו שלא יהא בו שנוי או חלוף. Either way of taking the Arabic יקף עליה (preserved it/ understood it) implies that the text has not been preserved in a good state, but in order to make his translation work Lambert has to supply in brackets "nous ferons ainsi" to provide an antecedent for the conjunction לילא (so that not), which is clearly intended to link together the two clauses rather than commence a separate statement. Kafach's translation is, therefore, preferable. The two Hebrew versions, printed in Haberman, "אבנים לחקר ספר יצירה" *Sinai* 20 (1946/7), p. 241, are not a great help at this point.

[4] G. Vajda, *Le Commentaire sur le Livre de la Création de Dūnaš ben Tāmīn de Kairouan (X^e siècle): Nouvelle édition revue et augmentée par Paul B. Fenton*, 2002, p. 129; Hebrew text, p. 241 and M. Grossberg, *Sefer Yezirah ascribed to the Patriarch Abraham with commentary by Dunash Ben Tamim*, 1902, p. 65. See also the notes to § 45 for further discussion of this passage in Dunash's commentary.

certainly correctly) to the incorporation into it of marginal notes and commentary material.[5] By implication Saadya locates this added material in the second half of the work (his chapters 5–8) when he remarks that there is little new in them and he does not intend to devote much effort to expounding them.[6] Dunash explicitly attributes to the work of commentators the material, mostly in the latter part of SY, which details the precise connections between each letter of the alphabet, element, and part of the human body.

These observations by the early commentators are fully vindicated when we come to compare the large number of manuscripts of SY that have been preserved since the Middle Ages. If we just take a word count of the three manuscripts which serve as the base texts for this edition we can see the extent of the problem. Ms A (Vatican Library (Cat. Assemani) 299(8), fols. 66a–71b) has 2737 words, Ms K (Parma 2784.14, De Rossi 1390, fols. 36b–38b) has 1883 words, while Ms C (Cambridge University Library, Taylor-Schechter K21/56 + Glass 32/5 + Glass 12/813) has 2066 words. Some manuscripts have far fewer words than Ms K – as few as 1300, while others range anywhere between this low figure and the full range of material seen in Ms A. See the Table of the Attestations of the Paragraphs of SY in Appendix I.

From the tenth century on, then, it has been recognized that SY existed in a number of recensions (נוסחאות) – some form of standard text, a longer version which contained commentary material, and a version which completely rearranged the material and which was attributed to Saadya Gaon.[7] Since the nineteenth century it has become conventional to refer to these versions as the Short, the Long and the Saadyan Recensions. The complex textual state in which SY has been handed down is implicitly recognized in the first printed edition (Mantua 1562) in which the Short Recension is printed as the main text (with commentaries) and the Long Recension as an appendix. The fundamental work on delineating the recensions of SY and working out which of them lay before the early commentators was achieved by A. Epstein in his articles in MGWJ (= Epstein 1893). However, his fundamental conclusions that the Saadyan Recension is no older than Saadya himself and that the Long Recension is really only a copy of the text which is embedded in Shabbetai Donnolo's commentary[8] have been invalidated by manuscript discoveries of which Epstein was unaware at the time. As we shall see, it is more likely that the recensions predate any of the known commentaries on SY.

---

[5] See I. Weinstock, לברור הנוסח של ספר יצירה, *Temirin* I, ed. I. Weinstock (1972), p. 12, for the relevant passages. There is a similar collection in Haberman 1946/7: 241.

[6] Kafach 1972: 127, Lambert 1891: 89.

[7] For the relevant passages in Dunash and Judah ben Barzillai's commentaries see A. Epstein, "Pseudo-Saadja's und Elasar Rokeach's Commentare zum Jezira-Buche: Die Recension Saadja's," *MGWJ* 37 (1893), p. 120, and his "Studien zum Jezira-Buche und seinem Erklaren", *MGWJ* 37 (1893), p. 459. However, see also Vajda-Fenton 2002: 150–157 for the problematic textual basis of the reference by Dunash to Saadya's commentary.

[8] Epstein 1893: 460.

2. Why a new edition of Sefer Yeṣira?

Prior to 1971 no proper critical edition of the text of SY was available. Professor Ithamar Gruenwald's "Preliminary Critical Edition of *Sefer Yezira*"[9] represents an enormous leap forward in the study of this text. For the first time we have an edition of the text based on a representative sample of the best manuscripts prior to the first printed editions.[10] As his base text Gruenwald presents a diplomatic (and almost entirely faultless) reproduction of the most important (and one of the two earliest) manuscripts – Vatican 299 (Ms A in my edition). Below it he presents two textual apparatuses – one combines the readings of the Long Recension and the Saadyan Recension,[11] the other presents the readings of the Short Recension manuscripts. Occasionally, he finds it impossible to present the Short Recension readings as variants from a basis represented by Ms A and prints the Long and Short Recensions in parallel columns. Finally, he adds a series of short notes and observations on the readings.

Why do I feel the need to provide a new and different edition of SY? Firstly, because we now have nearly all of a major textual witness, only part of which was available to Gruenwald[12] – the tenth century Genizah Scroll of the Saadyan Recension.[13] Secondly, because it seems to me preferable to present the Long and Saadyan Recensions separately with their own textual apparatuses.[14] Thirdly, since SY appears simultaneously in the tenth century in three separate recensions, then that is how the evidence should be laid out with diplomatic reproductions of the earliest manuscript of each recension as the main text and presented in parallel columns. Fourthly, including all manuscript variants produces an apparatus which is very difficult to read and in which it is hard to identify real or major variants in the

[9] *Israeli Oriental Studies* I (1971), 132–177.

[10] Lazarus Goldschmidt's edition, *Das Buch der Schöpfung* (Frankfurt 1894), is not based on a first-hand study of manuscripts but on the printed editions and commentaries. Gershom Scholem's judgement on this book is damning: "The so-called 'critically edited text' in the edition and translation of Lazarus Goldschmidt . . . is patched together in a completely arbitrary manner and devoid of scientific value" – *Origins of the Kabbalah* (Princeton 1990), p. 25, n.34. However, Goldschmidt's action of comparing the three main recensions (plus the Lurianic re-edition of SY) produced a number of valuable insights into the state of the text and these will be referred to later in the textual notes.

[11] Implicitly this accepts A. Epstein's view (1893:267) that the Saadyan Recension is really only a reshaping of the Long Recension and hence that there are really only two basic recensions of SY.

[12] In the edition of Habermann 1946/7.

[13] In the excellent edition by Nehemiah Allony: "ספר יצירה נוסח רס"ג בצורת מגילה מגניזת קהיר", *Temirin* II (1981), 9–29.

[14] Nicolas Séd's review of Gruenwald's edition – "Le Sēfer Yeṣīrā: l'édition critique, le texte primitif, la grammaire et la métaphysique", *REJ* 132 (1973), p. 518, similarly suggests the need to keep the recensions separate: "Le résultat obtenu par I. Gruenwald nous semble confirmer que seule l'édition parallèles trois recensions pourra apporter une réponse complète."

morass of clear scribal errors and orthographical variants.[15] Finally and inevitably, there are some errors in Gruenwald's collations. It is difficult to exclude all errors in collation and I would not claim to have done so myself, but between Gruenwald's edition of Ms A, Nehemiah Allony's of the Genizah Scroll (Ms C in this edition) and my edition of Parma 2784.14 (Ms K) readers should certainly have available reliable editions of the basic texts for the study of SY. In setting out all three together I hope that my edition makes it easier for scholars to work with these basic texts rather than continuing to use the defective printed editions, as many have continued to do even after Gruenwald's work was published.[16]

Gruenwald describes his edition as "preliminary." I am not sure that, given the state of the manuscripts, an edition of this text could be anything other than "preliminary." The manuscript tradition of SY is too varied and inconstant for anything like a definitive edition to be produced. Most manuscripts which contain SY either precede or follow it with a commentary or commentaries, but others embed the text within a commentary.[17] Often it is hard to discern where the text ends and commentary begins. For example, the weakly attested §§ 62–63 might be better regarded as commentary to § 48 than as part of the text. As the notes to the text of § 63 show this is where some manuscripts place part of this material, while one manuscript places § 63:3–4 in the margin alongside § 48. As we shall see one explanation for the origin of the Long Recension is that it arose from commentary on the Short Recension. Apart from the difficulty of fixing the borderline between text and commentary, a glance at the Table of the Order of the Paragraphs in Appendix II will demonstrate the freedom some scribes felt to re-arrange the text before them – almost to create a new text.

At about the same time that Gruenwald published his "Preliminary Edition" Israel Weinstock made a very different attempt to show what an edition of SY might look like.[18] He presents a sample edition of chapter 1 (i.e. §§ 1–16) using different type-faces to distinguish what he identifies as the four layers discernible now in the text. The four layers are:

---

[15] Reading SY in Gruenwald's edition with an honours class at the University of Edinburgh brought this point home forcibly to me.

[16] The latest example of this unfortunate practice is Yehuda Liebes' large-scale study of SY, תורת היצירה של ספר יצירה (English title: *Ars Poetica in Sefer Yetsira*), 2000. Liebes incorporates into his book a photographic reprint of the Mantua edition of the Long Recension of SY. He has many valuable insights into the interpretation of SY but he has not, however, made any significant contribution to the history of its textual development. He does use Gruenwald's edition from time to time, noting on occasion the variations between the recensions, though only very rarely mentioning specific manuscripts. But many of his observations are undermined by failure to take on board the problems of the textual attestation of the material he is discussing.

[17] British Library Or. 6577 (Cat. Margol. 736.5) – not included in our apparatus, is a good example of this. Fols. 40a–43b contain a Short Recension text, then fols. 43b–52a have a second version but embedded within a commentary.

[18] Weinstock 1972.

(1) The original text which is short, poetic, rhythmical and cryptic, with a 3/4 metre. Weinstock dates it to the Tannaitic period, possibly even towards the end of the Second Temple.
(2) A series of clarifications added in the talmudic period to make explicit things which the original author had intended to keep secret. For example, the creator of this layer added about one hundred lines to chapter one in order to clarify what the *sefirot* are.
(3) Weinstock's third layer is basically the Long Recension – a systematic series of additions in the form of a commentary, laid out like Rashi's commentaries. The style is said to be similar to that of the Gaonic midrashim. Weinstock dates this layer to the eighth or ninth centuries.
(4) The final layer consists of a series of headings and appended notes of various dates produced not long before SY emerges into the light of day in the early tenth century.

Weinstock considers whether to produce three separate apparatuses for the three recensions or whether to combine all three into a single text and apparatus. In the end he chose to provide a single text with a critical apparatus which divides the variants between the three recensions, though he grants that a fuller edition, serving a different purpose than his should include the three versions separately. His choice reflects his principal aim – to reconstruct the original text of SY before it separated out into the different recensions. As I have done, Weinstock introduces only a selection of variants, leaving out errors and orthographical variants.

I find Weinstock's apparatus difficult to use, much like Gruenwald's, but my main criticism is directed at the criteria which he developed to distinguish the four layers in the text. They leave him in the constant danger of arguing in a circle: the "source" layer is rhythmical and poetic, so mere dull prose must belong to a later layer. The "source" comes from the Tannaitic or even the end of the Second Temple period, so anything that reflects the style and language of other periods must be relegated to a later period and cannot belong to the "original text." And so on. A preferable procedure is to start with the text-critical evidence we have and to present it in as objective a fashion as possible. We can then ask what material is attested in all three recensions, what in two or just one? What appears in the supplementary readings in a few manuscripts or only a single manuscript? If the material that is not attested by all manuscripts begins to reveal common characteristics or language, can we identify where it came from, on the supposition that it was added to an earlier core text? On the other hand, could we explain its absence on the supposition that it was cut out by later editors/copyists who objected to the presence of potentially dangerous, subversive or obsolete ideas? The essential thing is to start with objective facts – what is, or is not attested in the manuscripts. On this solid basis it may then be possible to make conjectures as to how a work like SY could have evolved in the time before we have actual evidence of its existence (i.e. the

early tenth century). This would involve projecting backwards to before this time lines of development clearly discernible in the transmission of the text after the tenth century. If this procedure points, for example, to an earlier form of the text which was "rhythmical and poetic", then we are on firmer (though still somewhat shaky) ground when we apply such criteria in the absence of text-critical evidence. As we shall see, there are a striking number of cases where proceeding in this manner does bring us to the same conclusions as Weinstock on the layering of the text of SY (though not on the dating of the layers).[19]

3. The "original text" of SY or "the earliest recoverable text"?

What, however, we can never do is to get back to the "original text", Weinstock's "source" (מקור). The scribal practices of medieval Jewish copyists are the major reason why the search for an "original text" is almost bound to be frustrated. As Malachi Beit-Arié points out, the lack of centralised political and religious institutions in medieval Jewry meant that no control could be exercised over individual copying of texts:

"Encouraged by authors to correct their works, and aware of the unavoidable corruption imposed by the unconscious mechanics of copying, copyists in particular did not view copying as mechanical reproduction, but instead as a critical editorial operation involving emendation, diagnostic conjecture, collation of different exemplars and even incorporating external, relevant material and the copyist's own opinion.

Consequently, many Hebrew manuscripts present texts not only corrupted by the accumulation of unsupervised involuntary copying errors, but also distorted by editorial or even redactoral reconstruction, contamination by different models and versions, and deliberate integration of pertinent texts."[20]

Another factor which Beit-Arié also regards as potentially fatal for the effort to reconstruct the "original text" is the way in which authors continued to update and expand their works with the result that manuscripts copied at different stages of the evolution of a text would be in circulation at the same time and inevitably then

[19] Séd 1973: 518–522 subjects Weinstock's edition to devastating criticism. Most of the points he makes are valid but Weinstock's work is not entirely worthless; some pearls can be rescued from the mire.

[20] *Hebrew Manuscripts of East and West: Towards a Comparative Codicology* (London, 1993), p. 83. Beit-Arié finesses these observations in his paper on "The Palaeographical Identification of Hebrew Manuscripts" (1986/87: 14) when he makes a distinction between the attitude to the text being copied of the professional scribe working for hire and that of the individual author copying a text for his own use: "While the first scribe [the professional] is more vulnerable to unconscious mistakes conditioned by the copied text and the mechanism of copying, the second one [the individual owner/scholar] may feel free to change the copied text consciously by amending and editing what might seem to him corrupted passages, sentences or words, collating other versions or completing missing or abbreviated parts relying on memory and the authority of his scholarship."

would cross-fertilize. All these features that Beit-Arié identifies can easily be seen in the manuscript tradition of SY. Beit-Arié draws the following lesson for text-editors from the above observations: "many principles and practices of classical text criticism, such as establishing the genetic relationships between manuscripts, the stemmatic classification of versions and restoring the original text, are not applicable to Hebrew manuscripts" ... (*ibid.*). None of these will be attempted in this edition. I prefer to use the term "earliest recoverable text" rather than the "original text" of Sefer Yeṣira. The "earliest recoverable text" is the one which can be ascertained from the manuscript information we have available, using the standard techniques of textual criticism. As my notes to the text will show this usually amounts to identifying the textual material which all the three recensions have in common – the lowest common denominator. However, this can only take us back to a stage just before the emergence of the earliest manuscripts we possess – say, the second half of the ninth century C.E. Undoubtedly, the processes described by Beit-Arié will have been at work long before this, making the "original text" irrecoverable. In my reconstruction in Appendix Three of the earliest recoverable text of SY I have attempted by means of square brackets to identify those parts which I suspect were added in the process of transmission but for which there is little or no text-critical evidence to back up my judgements. Some of this bracketed material could well have its origin in the kind of muddle that Beit-Arié sees arising from authors' own continuous updating of their work. The main text of the Appendix outside the brackets is based on textual evidence. The reasons for the judgements I make are provided in the commentary.

The state in which we find the text of SY is not, of course, unique for Jewish works from the first millennium C.E. Take, for example, the text of Pirke Aboth. What a text-critical nightmare is revealed when we dig below the level of editions like that of Herford (1962) which seem almost designed to keep their readership ignorant of the real situation. PA like SY exists in three separate recensions in which both the text and the order of the material varies. At the level of the individual manuscripts there is even more variation. One can make comments on the history and development of this text and the rabbinic values which it reveals but the search for the "original" PA is doomed to failure. There never was one – just an ever-growing collection of rabbinic sayings attached to the end of the Mishnah in order to encourage people to study it. The closest parallel to the phenomena which greet the scholar when studying texts like PA and SY is actually the three Synoptic Gospels, for there we have a large mass of sayings which reveal a bewildering mixture of both order and disorder while yet quite clearly having a common origin. I am very much inclined to agree with my, sadly now-deceased colleague, John O'Neill that "Matthew, Mark, and Luke as we have them are the end product of three lines of scribal tradition. They are not the work of three authors who looked across at unified sources and made hundreds of changes on each page at their authorial will" (O'Neill 1991: 500). Somewhat closer to home, it is instructive to compare the state

of the text of SY with that of the Hekhalot texts since it is generally transmitted in exactly the same Hebrew manuscripts. Here the most revealing comparison is between the medieval European Hekhalot manuscripts and the oriental, Genizah fragments, as Joseph Dan says: "less than half of the twenty-three Genizah fragments conform even in part to the *Synopse* structure,[21] and less than half of these contain substantial fragments of the same structure."[22] Klaus Hermann's study of the famous Hekhalot manuscript, New York 8128, came to the same conclusions as Dan over the freedom medieval scribes felt to supplement and even reshape the traditions they were transmitting.[23] Finally, in this attempt to set the state of the textual tradition of SY in its wider context of the transmission of Jewish literature as a whole, let us mention the earliest Hebrew and Arabic Jewish anti-Christian polemical texts. Once again, we meet the ubiquitous "three versions." To cite first Daniel Lasker: "It may be concluded, therefore, that there was a body of anti-Christian polemic in Judaeo-Arabic that was compiled in at least three versions: Schlosberg's *Qiṣṣa,*[24] the Arabic *Vorlage* of the *Nesṭor* manuscripts,[25] and the Genizah fragments. What the original form of that anti-Christian polemic was cannot now be determined."[26] In the same volume Sarah Stroumsa deals with the *Qiṣṣa Mujādalat al-Usquf* of which the *Sefer Nesṭor* is a Hebrew version and comments: "And yet an attempt to collate the Arabic fragments with Schlosberg's edition, or with each other, turns out to be a frustrating task: although they clearly belong to the same work, they hardly ever correspond from beginning to end. Each of the fragments contains more or less the same paragraphs but the vocabulary may vary considerably, as may also the order of the paragraphs."[27] An editor of SY can sympathize with Stroumsa's frustration. So the situation we observe in the manuscripts of SY is by no means unique and, hence, we need to consider now how other editors of such texts have dealt with the problems posed for us by the transmitters of these traditions.

---

[21] Dan is here referring to Peter Schäfer's *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (1981); see below.

[22] "The Ancient Hekhalot Texts in the Middle Ages: Tradition, Source, Inspiration", *BJRL* 75.3 (1993), 93–94, and 1998: 257.

[23] "Re-written Mystical Texts: the Transmission of the Heikhalot Literature in the Middle Ages", *BJRL* 75.3 (1993).

[24] Leon Schlosberg, *Qiṣṣa Mujādalat al-Usquf* (Vienna, 1880).

[25] Abraham Berliner, *Sefer Nesṭor Ha-Komer* (Altona, 1875).

[26] Daniel J. Lasker, "*Qiṣṣa Mujādalat al-Usquf* and *Nesṭor Ha-Komer*: The earliest Arabic and Hebrew Jewish anti-Christian polemics", in *Genizah research after ninety years: The case of Judaeo-Arabic*, ed. Joshua Blau and Stefan C. Reif (Cambridge, 1992), 114.

[27] Sara Stroumsa, "*Qiṣṣa Mujādalat al-Usquf*: A case study in polemical literature", in *Genizah research after ninety years, 155–159.*

4. Editing Jewish texts from the first millennium C.E.

Given this situation which confronts scholars working on the medieval manuscripts, the question of how to edit Hebrew texts from Late Antiquity and the early medieval period has been widely debated in recent years.[28] Peter Schäfer has more or less proclaimed the death of the so-called "critical edition" but has also challenged the notion of regarding Jewish texts of this period as "texts", i.e. as works consciously shaped by authors which can be studied by techniques applicable to modern literary works (Schäfer 1988).[29] He has argued that this concept of the text ignores the reality of the textual evidence we have for nearly all Jewish texts from this period. Most of them are attested in medieval manuscripts mainly from Europe and they contain a bewildering variety of text types. How can we know that these texts were not put into their present shape by the scribes of these medieval manuscripts? – much the same question as arises from Beit-Arié's observations quoted earlier. Schäfer's approach to textual criticism was enshrined first in his ground-breaking *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (1981) and now in his *Synopse zum Talmud-Yerushalmi* (1991–). Schäfer provides no critical apparatus in these works but just lays out the text of the most important manuscripts in synoptic form. He leaves it to scholars using his works to make what comments they like on the text and, if they so wish, to engage in the futile task of reconstructing an original text which never existed. The extent of Schäfer's scepticism can be gauged from the introduction to his synopsis of the Jerusalem Talmud where he claims that the most that can be achieved is to reconstruct the text as it existed in the thirteenth to eighteenth centuries.[30]

I have a lot of sympathy for Schäfer's position. However, I am not as pessimistic as he is over the possibilities of using textual criticism to at least reconstruct earlier forms of texts than are attested in the manuscripts we have. Hence the layout of my edition of SY is a compromise between that of Gruenwald and that which would be suggested if I followed Schäfer's procedures in his synopses.[31] I present the earliest manuscripts of the three main recensions in synoptic form with a limited textual apparatus for each of them. Only major variants affecting the meaning of the text are presented in the apparatus; errors and orthographical variants are excluded. The principal function of the apparatus is to provide support for my observations in the commentary on the text. Where, in any particular paragraph, recording the

[28] I have dealt with this issue in some detail with particular reference to SY in Hayman 1995.

[29] *Hekhalot-Studien* (Tübingen, 1988).

[30] Schäfer 1991: VII.

[31] I have taken to heart Malachi Beit-Arié's advice at the end of his 1993c article (p. 51) where he says that we must use medieval Hebrew manuscripts "with great caution, suspicion and scepticism, and above all refrain from establishing authentic texts, or even critical editions, and rather resort to the safe synoptic presentation of the transmitted texts, while proposing our critical analysis and reconstruction in the form of notes."

readings of a manuscript would overly complicate the apparatus because it varies too much from the base manuscript for its recension I have printed its text in full in the synoptic section. Moreover, I have from time to time varied the base manuscript for the collations – though always printing the text of the three main manuscripts. See, for example, the apparatus to § 15 where I have collated all the short recension manuscripts to Ms P rather than K. My aim throughout has been to make the critical apparatus as simple as possible.

My solution to the problems of editing the text of SY may be contrasted with that chosen by Daniel Abrams in his edition of *The Book Bahir*.[32] Faced with the more than one hundred extant manuscripts of this text Abrams chose to provide a diplomatic reproduction of the earliest dated manuscript (Munich 209) with an apparatus recording the variants of the next earliest dated manuscript (Vatican-Barberini Or. 110). These two manuscripts represent two separate recensions of the text and, in Abrams's opinion, all the other extant manuscripts descend from one or other of these recensions. The Munich manuscript has been extensively corrected and readings from the other recension (and some from an unknown source) recorded in the margin and hence the manuscript represents "a kind of critical edition of the Bahir as it was known in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries."[33] But to more clearly illustrate the differences between his two manuscripts Abrams does also set out in parallel columns thirteen of the one hundred and forty paragraphs of *Sepher Ha-Bahir*. It might have been better and more helpful to the reader for him to have set out all the paragraphs in this fashion. Abrams regards his work not as a definitive edition of the text but as providing "what will hopefully be the groundwork for future enquiries in the text and its influence" (1994: *11). He provides a list of the other manuscripts of the text and refers to some of their readings in the course of his discussions of the redaction and reception history of the text. Reading between the lines one has the feeling that Abrams thinks that not a great deal would be gained by the massive amount of work required to provide a complete critical edition based on all the manuscript evidence. That is my own feeling in the case of SY. What is required at this stage is an edition that makes the major recensions and variants available to scholars in as usable a form as possible. SY is a short enough text to make an edition based on nineteen manuscripts possible, but one based on the one-hundred and thirty-one manuscripts listed in the Collective Catalogue of the Jewish National and University Microfilm Institute would be a daunting task and probably virtually unreadable, unless the choice of variants to be included in the apparatus was ruthlessly selective – very much more so than the choice represented in this edition of SY. But what represents a real variant and what is just a scribal error are matters over which scholars constantly disagree, and, in any case,

[32] *The Book Bahir: An Edition Based on the Earliest Manuscripts* (Los Angeles, 1994).
[33] Abrams 1994: *11–*12.

real variants can arise as the result of scribal attempts to correct previous errors! So, much like Abrams, my use of the manuscripts whose text is not diplomatically reproduced in the parallel columns but utilised in the critical apparatus is much more aimed at providing evidence for my judgments on the history of the text than conforming to the structure of the traditional critical edition. Scholars who wish to see the full range of evidence from the early manuscripts of SY can still have recourse to Gruenwald's edition.

Faced with the same set of problems that confront the editor of SY, David Stec opts for the diplomatic solution in his edition of the rabbinic Targum of Job: "it is the responsibility of the editor to present a faithful transcription of the text as it is found in one manuscript, and to note all the variants in the apparatus."[34] However, the nature of the Targum manuscripts with which he has to deal often drives him to abandon this procedure and adopt the synoptic method. But, as he points out, this variation between the diplomatic and the synoptic procedure still depends very much on the judgement of the editor as to the point at which the manuscript tradition diverges too much to make the diplomatic procedure feasible.[35] Such an eclectic procedure would be possible in the case of SY, as Gruenwald's edition shows. However, as I have stated above, it seems preferable to be consistent and, as far as possible, keep the editor's judgement to the textual notes and to confront the reader directly with the textual chaos which is all too often present in the manuscripts. In the case of SY only rarely will just three manuscripts plus apparatus suffice to adequately represent this situation. Sometimes the texts of up to seven manuscripts will need to be reproduced in order to fairly present the range of variations. Where the element of editorial judgement still remains in my procedure is over which variants are worth recording in the textual apparatuses. But the subjectivity of this procedure is partly obviated by the printing of the full text of the manuscripts when the variations demand it and also by the availability of Gruenwald's edition. Comparison with that will reveal the variants which I have judged to be errors or too trivial to be worth recording in the apparatus.

The constantly repetitive language of SY laid it wide open to mechanical errors in the process of transmission and many scribes were unable to copy it properly. Some manuscripts are so marred by errors that they are virtually unusable in an edition and have, therefore, been left out. Many of the numerous manuscripts of the Short Recension were rejected on these grounds. However, some manuscripts are important enough to be included despite the state of their text (manuscripts B[1]G and H, for example) though I have not attempted to record their errors in the apparatus – particularly since most of them are recorded in Gruenwald's apparatus. We do not have enough manuscripts of the Long Recension to permit the luxury of

[34] *The Text of the Targum of Job: An Introduction and Critical Edition* (Leiden, 1994), p. 99.
[35] *Ibid.* 105.

leaving some out. I have seen no reason to deviate from Gruenwald's choice of the manuscripts on which to base an edition of SY. However, I have decided not to include collations from the first printed edition since these are provided in his edition (ת[1] and ת[2]) and would only further complicate my apparatus for no great gain – especially since, as Gruenwald remarks, ת[1] and ת[2] are full of mistakes. I have added two manuscripts to his list (B[1] and E) for reasons discussed below. Further reasons for rejecting other manuscripts that might have been included are also given below in the notes on the manuscripts.

5. The Manuscripts

5.1 The Long Recension[36]

A Vatican Library (Cat. Assemani) 299(8), fols. 66a–71b. Tenth century[37]. Square script similar to the Genizah Scroll (Ms C). Gruenwald's א.

B[1] Oxford, Bodleian Library Ms. Mich.9 (Cat. Neubauer 1531), fols. 1b–11b. Ashkenazi semi-cursive script of the early fourteenth century.[38]

B[2] Oxford, Bodleian Library Ms. Mich.9 (Cat. Neubauer 1531), fols. 95a–103b. Ashkenazi cursive script "c. 1300"[39] Gruenwald's ב.

G British Library, Add.15,299 (Cat. Margoliouth 752/13), fols. 79a–81b. Ashkenazi square script, fourteenth century. Gruenwald's ג.

D Florence, Library Mediceo-Laurentsiana, Pluteo II 5/9, fols. 227a–230a. Italy, sixteenth century,[40] cursive script. Gruenwald's ד.

H British Library, Add.27,199 (Cat. Margoliouth 737/2), fols. 379b–387a. Italian semi-cursive script. 1515. Gruenwald's ה.

---

[36] Information on the script, place of origin and date of the Mss is taken from the relevant library catalogues or from the Collective Catalogue of Hebrew Manuscripts of the Microfilm Institute of the Jewish National and University Library in Jerusalem. The sigla of the Mss are, as far as possible, the English equivalents of those used by Gruenwald and hence the order is that of the Hebrew alphabet.

[37] See Gruenwald 1971: 135.

[38] Beit-Arié-May 1994: 256. The Supplement to Neubauer's catalogue seems to reverse his judgement on the relative dating of parts 1–3 (fols. 1–18) and parts 4–13 (fols. 19–183). Neubauer 1886: 538 states that numbers 1–3 are "older than the others"; the order in which I list the two parts of this manuscript reflects their position in the manuscript and not their relative dating.

[39] Beit-Arié-May 1994: 256. See P. Schäfer 1981: ix, xix–xx for a full description of this manuscript. See also Schäfer 1989: vol. III, p. VII, n.4.

[40] Though Gruenwald 1971: 136 says "written probably in Italy in the fifteenth century."

5.2 The Saadyan Recension

C The Genizah Scroll[41], Cambridge University Library, Taylor-Schechter K21/56 + Glass 32/5 + Glass 12/813.[42] Oriental square script. Tenth century. Gruenwald's ת.

Z Oxford, Bodleian Library Pococke 256 (Cat. Neubauer 1533).[43] Oriental semi-cursive script. Baghdad. 1262. Gruenwald's ז.

E British Library, Harley 5510 (Cat. Margoliouth 754/6), fols. 107a–110a. Italian semi-cursive script of the fourteenth – fifteenth century.[44]

5.3 The Short Recension

K Parma 2784.14 (Bibliotheca Palatina 2784/14), De Rossi 1390, fols. 36b–38b. Italian semi-cursive script. 1286.[45] Gruenwald's כ.

L Paris 802/5, fols.57b–59b (Cat. Zotenberg, p.135). Italian semi-cursive script of the fourteenth century. Gruenwald's ל.

M Paris 726/2, fols. 44b–46b (Cat. Zotenberg, p.118). Semi-cursive Sephardi script of the fifteenth century.[46] Gruenwald's מ.

N Paris 764/1, fols. 1a–3a (Cat. Zotenberg, p.124). According to Gruenwald "written in Spain (or North Africa) between 1365 and 1393".[47] Semi-cursive Sephardi script. Gruenwald's נ.

---

[41] The scroll would have unrolled vertically rather than horizontally like biblical scrolls. For the significance of this see Schäfer 1984: 9, especially n. 1, and Colette Sirat, *Hebrew Manuscripts of the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2002), p. 103, for a photograph of a similarly constructed Geniza scroll.

[42] For full details see the edition of this scroll by Allony 1981. This edition supercedes Haberman 1946/7.

[43] See the editions by Lambert: 1891 and Kafach 1972: and the Supplement to Neubauer (Beit-Arié-May 1994: 256).

[44] Part 6 of this Ms also includes on fols. 110a–112a a not particularly good Short Recension text of SY which has some unique glosses and expansions. It has not, therefore, been included in this edition.

[45] Richler and Beit-Arié 2001: 314–316.

[46] The date given is that of the Collective Catalogue of the JNUL Microfilm Institute. However, Gruenwald dates it to the fourteenth century and, indeed, its script is not greatly different from that of Ms N with which, as we shall see it has very close connections. However, it is perhaps closer to the examples of fifteenth century Sephardi semi-cursive illustrated in A. Yardeni, *The Book of Hebrew Script: History, Palaeography, Script Styles, Calligraphy and Design* (Jerusalem, 1977), 244–49.

[47] Gruenwald 1971: 136. According to Zotenberg "Le ms. a été exécuté par 'Amram, fils de Moïse, par Joseph, fils de Siméon. Il fut cédé par Hayyim, fils de ce dernier, à Mas'ond, fils de Sabbathaï, en 1397."

S Leiden Warn. 24/5, Cod. Or. 4762, fols.140b–142a (Cat. Steinschneider, p.91). Greek semi-cursive script "written possibly in Hebron, Palestine, about 1540".[48] Gruenwald's ס .

F British Library Or.1263 (Cat. Margoliouth 600.1), fols. 2a–3b -- according to Margoliouth a Karaite Ms dated 1433 "or perhaps copied from a Ms of that date." Semi-cursive script. Gruenwald's ע.

P Klau Library (Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion), Cincinnati 523/1. Semi-cursive Sephardi script of the fifteenth century. No pagination in Ms but the text of SY occupies pp. 1–11. Gruenwald's פ.

I British Library, Or.10,324/3 (Cat. Gaster 293), fols. 29a–32a. Semi-cursive Sephardi script of the fifteen century.[49] Gruenwald's צ.[50]

Q Moscow (Lenin State Library), Ginzburg Collection 133/15, fols. 198a–199a. Written in "Germany, end of the fifteenth century or beginning of the sixteenth century" according to Gruenwald but from Italy according to the Catalogue of the JNUL Microfilm Institute. Gruenwald's ק.

R Paris 809/2, fols. 93a–94a (Cat. Zotenberg, p.137). Italy, about 1500. A fine, delicate, semi-cursive veering to cursive script.[51] Gruenwald's ר.

6. The rules of the edition

6.1 The aim of this edition is to present the evidence for the textual history of Sefer Yeṣira in as clear a fashion as possible. Therefore the text of the three main recensions is printed in parallel columns, each with its own textual apparatus. Ms K in the left hand column usually serves as the base text for the Short Recension, Ms A in the middle column for the long Recension, and Ms C in the right hand column for the Saadyan recension. Where the text of any other manuscript diverges too far from the base manuscript in its recension to make collating its variants useful, I have printed its full text in the relevant column. Thus, for example, Ms D which often hovers between the long and the Short Recensions in its readings is frequently printed in full below the text of Ms A.

[48] Gruenwald *ibid.*, Steinschneider, p. 88–89. Steinschneider is in error on p. 91 when he says that the text of SY begins on fol. 160v.

[49] The date is that of the JNUL Collective Catalogue. Gaster dates this Ms to the sixteenth century.

[50] Note that Gruenwald lists this Ms, in error, as Gaster 415, as does Weinstock 1972: 25.

[51] The text of SY comes at the end and in a different hand from that of the rest of the Ms.

6.2 The texts are printed as they appear in the manuscripts, except that where there is physical damage to a manuscript I have attempted to restore its text. These restorations are placed between square brackets and are based on the evidence of the other manuscripts.

6.3 Errors in these base manuscripts are printed as they stand, except for errors which have been corrected by the original scribe. Obvious errors in other manuscripts are not recorded in the textual apparatuses.[52]

6.4 Unambiguous abbreviations in the base manuscripts are usually, but not always, written out fully.

6.5 I have not followed Gruenwald's edition in attempting to punctuate the Hebrew manuscripts. Punctuation is only provided where there is a corresponding mark in the manuscript.[53] How I understand the sense divisions within the paragraphs is indicated by my translations.

6.6 Above the textual apparatus in each column there appears a list of the manuscripts available and collated for the relevant paragraph. The number of manuscripts which contain the text of a particular paragraph can also be checked by referring to the Table of Attestations in Appendix I. The place where the paragraph appears in each manuscript can be seen from the Table listing the order of the paragraphs in Appendix II.

6.7 The critical apparatus is selective. Purely grammatical and orthographical variants are usually not recorded neither are obvious scribal errors.[54] Hence conclusions *e silentio* cannot be drawn. In general, the apparatus aims to record variants which indicate a significant change in meaning, and to present as clearly as possible the relation between the manuscripts. Within each recension the choice of the base manuscript(s) for the collation is based on this latter criterion and on the need to keep the apparatus as simple as possible.

6.8 The copula ו is not collated except where a change of meaning may be implied.

6.9 A number with raised circle, e.g. 1^0, 2^0, after a word in a lemma indicates the first, second, etc., occurrence of that word in the paragraph.

6.10 An asterisk alongside the siglum for a Ms (e.g. A*) indicates the reading of the original hand. A raised c (e.g. A^c) indicates the reading of a later corrector in the text, while a raised mg (e.g. A^{mg}) indicates the reading of a later corrector which has been placed in the margin.

[52] Most of these errors are recorded in Gruenwald's edition.

[53] Sometimes the quality of the microfilms and photographs from which I have worked makes the punctuation difficult to discern.

[54] These also are usually recorded in Gruenwald's edition.

7. Abbreviations in the textual apparatus

... (within a lemma) =	all the words between the words preceding and following the dots.
... (within a list of Mss) =	all the Mss as arranged in the list of Mss from the manuscript preceding the dots to the one following the dots.
Mss =	manuscripts
Ms =	manuscript
om =	omits
add =	adds
homoio =	omission by homoioteleuton
homoioarc =	omission by homoioarcton
App =	Apparatus
err =	error
pr =	prior (places before it)
ln (*legi nequit*) =	cannot be read
ditt =	dittography
rd =	read
transp =	transposes the words separated by the back slash
חנכל שצם =	חמה נוגה ·כוכב־חמה לבנה שבתי צדק מאדים
שצם חנכל =	שבתי צדק מאדים חמה נוגה כוכב־חמה לבנה

8. Notes on the manuscripts

8.1 The Long Recension

A: The square script of this manuscript is clearly written and easily legible. There is no title for the text. The punctuation between paragraphs is by a simple dot plus a space. A few corrections have been made by the original scribe. See, for example, Gruenwald's note 2 to § 11. A later hand has made marginal corrections to §§ 18 and 37.[55]

B[1]: This is a carelessly written manuscript with numerous errors, most of them uncorrected, which may be why Gruenwald did not include it in his edition. However, after Ms A, it is one of our earliest representatives of the Long Recension version of the text and should, therefore, be present in an edition of SY. There are some corrections within the text and marginal corrections by a later hand. The scribe or

[55] Gruenwald 1971 prints facsimiles of two pages of this manuscript between pp. 138 and 139.

his exemplar has attempted to implement a numbered paragraph division as well as the standard chapter division. However, this begins to peter out in chapter IV (after § 37) and disappears completely in chapter V (after § 45). Despite being incorporated in the same manuscript as B^2 it shares no peculiar readings with it.[56] However, there are a striking number of peculiar readings shared with Ms H, especially numerous omissions by parablepsis. Note for example their shared gloss in § 55 (זהו תלי גדול המזלות) or their shared text in § 48a which forces me to print the text of B^1 separately and collate to it Ms H's two very minor deviations. However, one manuscript cannot be a copy of the other since not all their errors or omissions are shared. In § 61, for example, B^1 has a long omission by homoioteleuton (ברית...לו) which is not shared with H and H has § 10, which B^1 does not. Nevertheless, the connections between these two manuscripts are close enough to suggest that they have a common ancestor. The text of the Long Recension in the first printed edition (Mantua 1562) comes from the same line of transmission as B^1 and H. There is an intriguing shared reading of these two manuscripts in § 54.4 which suggests that ultimately they depend on a manuscript that has descended from A. See the notes to this paragraph.

B^2: Ms B^2 contains many errors and has been extensively corrected both by the original and a later scribe. The latter rewrites many words above the line though the original writing is mostly perfectly legible. The scribe has numbered the paragraphs in chapter I (= §§ 1–16) but not thereafter. The paragraph divisions are then marked with a short back slash and a space. At least three scribes seem to have been involved in the copying of the text of SY with changeovers taking place in the middle of §§ 49 and 57.

G: This manuscript is so badly copied and full of errors that Gruenwald was led to abandon his usual policy and not record its "obvious mistakes" in his apparatus. The paragraphs are numbered by letters and the end of the paragraphs indicated by a double vertical line, but the numbering system fizzles out from § 52 onwards. Against all the other manuscripts which have a chapter division Ms G does not end a chapter with § 22 but has a four chapter division: I (1–16), II (9/17–36), III (37–44), IV (45–64).

D: This is a carefully written manuscript with few errors. As explained above it has a distinctive text which often falls between the Long and Short Recensions so that rather than attempt to collate its readings within the Long Recension apparatus it very often makes sense to print its full text. Its cursive script makes it very difficult to distinguish between Bet and Kaph. Bet is usually slightly more dipped

[56] In § 15 it shares the reading ביוד with B^2 but the reading בידו in Ms H is clearly a transpositional error for ביוד, so the exemplar of H had the same reading as B^1 and B^2.

at the top than Kaph but not always. Hence there is some uncertainty about readings like ברצוא/כרצוא in § 8. The manuscript makes heavy use of abbreviations and the scribe was clearly looking to lighten his workload. See the comments on the text of this manuscript in the notes on §§ 41, 44, and 54. In contrast to all other manuscripts than C Ms D does not have any chapter divisions; paragraph divisions are indicated by a single or double dot.

H: H is a large manuscript of 601 folios containing the works of Eleazar of Worms and copied by Elias Levita for Cardinal Aegidio de Viterbo. It contains SY plus Eleazar's commentary. But like G it is poorly written and full of mistakes. We have already noted its close connection with Ms B^{1}. It has a paragraph numbering system similar to that of Ms B^{1}.

8.2 The Saadyan Recension

C: The most important witness for the Saadyan Recension is the Genizah Scroll. This was torn into three pieces which were scattered in different places in the Cairo Genizah and are now in Cambridge University Library (Taylor-Schechter Genizah Unit). The central piece (Taylor-Schechter Glass 32/5) containing chapters 2:4 – 7:1 was edited by A.M. Haberman in 1946/7.[57] Subsequently, Nehemiah Allony identified the other two pieces among the Genizah fragments in the Cambridge University Library and produced an edition of the complete scroll in 1981.[58] Israel Weinstock (the editor of Temirin) was responsible for filling the lacunae in the Scroll (in square brackets) and also for providing a textual apparatus comparing the Scroll with the text of SY found in Saadya's commentary (Oxford, Bodleian Library Pococke 256 – Z in this edition). In his introduction (p.11) Allony lists six fragments of Saadya's commentary, one from the Genizah and the rest in the Bodleian Library but these are not used in the textual apparatus. The Scroll contains no chapter and paragraph divisions and what little punctuation there is does not coincide with the paragraph divisions found in Saadya's commentary. According to Allony, the Scroll was copied in the tenth to eleventh centuries (more likely the earlier) in Palestine. The rest of the Scroll contains various *piyyutim* all of Palestinian origin.

The three fragments of the Scroll are as follows. T-S K21/56 contains one page of the Scroll (1:1 – 2:6 in Saadya's chapter and paragraph division), lines 1–55 of Allony's edition. This leaf is torn from the top left to the bottom right and matches exactly T-S (Glass) 32.5 which contains two pages of the Scroll (2:4 – 7:2), lines 46–195 in Allony. T-S (Glass) 12/813 contains one page of the Scroll (7:3 – the end), lines 199–232 in Allony's edition. Except for a few lines where T-S (Glass) 32.5

[57] "אבנים לחקר ספר יצירה", *Sinai* 20, 241–265.
[58] "ספר יצירה נוסח רס"ג בצורת מגילה מגניזת קהיר", *Temirin* II, 9–29.

ends and before T-S (Glass) 12/813 begins we now have the whole of this scroll. The manuscript is written in a square oriental script similar to that of Ms A but it has suffered considerable damage and is often difficult to read. The punctuation, in particular, is hard to discern and where I am uncertain of it I have left it out. It is a rather carelessly written manuscript with a number of accidental omissions and dittographies. There are some slight differences between my readings and those of Allony – usually over the visibility or otherwise of single letters. Allony's collations are mostly accurate with only the occasional error, e.g. ובחיך for ובחק in § 17. It is a pity that Allony occasionally confuses the reader by placing in square brackets readings imported from Ms Z for which there is no space in Ms C. For example, in § 37b he gives the reading חלש[ו], but this is Saadya's reading and there is no space in Ms C for the Waw. It would have been better to have placed such readings in round brackets or, better still, resisted the temptation to improve the Genizah scroll from Saadya's text. In my transcription, as in Allony's, the restorations in square brackets are taken from the text found embedded in Saadya's commentary on SY (Z in my edition) – but only where there is a matching space in C.

Z: The other primary witness to the text of this recension is that found in Saadya Gaon's commentary on SY written in 931 – hence the name given to the recension. Prior to the discovery of the Genizah Scroll this commentary was the only evidence for the existence of a third recension alongside the Short and Long Recensions. Only one complete manuscript of Saadya's commentary has survived: Oxford, Bodleian Library Pococke 256. This is available in two editions, one by Mayer Lambert in 1891[59] (Arabic and Hebrew text with French translation) and one by Joseph Kafach in 1972[60] (Arabic text in Hebrew script as in the manuscript, and Hebrew translation). Kafach's edition does contain an apparatus recording the variants of the other fragmentary manuscripts of Saadya's commentary.[61] Kafach is rightly critical of some aspects of Lambert's work and, of the two, both his transcription of the manuscript and his translation are more reliable. In the Oxford manuscript the text is divided into eight chapters, and the chapters into separate paragraphs (הלכות).[62] The manuscript was written in Baghdad in 1263 according to the colophon provided by the scribe.[63] The occasional vocalisation of the text appears to be in the hand of the original scribe.

E: Along with the primary witnesses to the Saadyan Recension (Mss C and Z) I have included collations from Ms E (British Library, Harley 5510), because this

---

[59] *Commentaire sur le Séfer Yesira ou livre de la creation par le Gaon Saadya de Fayyoum* (Paris: Émile Bouillon).

[60] ספר יצירה השלם עם תרגום ופירוש רבנו סעדיה גאון (Jerusalem: Dror).

[61] See his list on p.7 of his edition.

[62] See below on the chapter divisions in the Mss.

[63] See Kafach 1972:6 for a transcription of the colophon and information on the scribe.

manuscript generally supports the arrangement of the material as it is found in Ms C, and cannot simply have been derived from the text of SY found in Saadya's commentary. It has the eight chapter divisions found in Oxford, Bodleian Library Pococke 256 but not the paragraph divisions. This is the manuscript which Weinstock (1972: 29) lists as his ⁷ל but when he gives the folios in which the text appears as 212a–216a he is using an older page numbering. The newer page numbering is folios 107a–110a as I have given above. The Italian semi-cursive script of this manuscript is sometimes difficult to read.

Another British Library Ms (Or. 1263, fols. 3b–6a)[64] does, however, follow very closely the text as it appears in Saadya's commentary and it may well have been copied from it. Since it contains little of independent value and contains many errors and additions, it has been excluded from the apparatus. The manuscript edited by Langerman (1997: 49–64) is a defective copy of the Saadyan version. It has many scribal idiosyncrasies and errors; as Langerman says: "certain features of the text as found in our manuscript are quite certainly later accretions, perhaps even the doings of the copyist himself" (1997: 50).[65] A number of errors, which the manuscript shares with Ms Z (over against Mss C and E), suggest that ultimately it goes back to the version of SY found in Saadya's commentary. Accordingly, it too has not been included in this edition. Finally, Paris 770, fols 41b–45b, a fifteenth century text which Weinstock (1972:29) lists as his ⁸ל has also not been included. It is a strange manuscript, which mostly follows the paragraph order of the Saadyan version, but its text is an eclectic mixture of all three recensions. Some duplications make it fairly clear that the scribe had available at least one manuscript of each recension and was attempting to create a new text out of them. For example, after § 37b he repeats § 38 which he has already given earlier in both the Saadyan order (chapter 2:3) and the Saadyan text form, but this time his text is unique though closest to the Short Recension Mss S and R. The manuscript has no chapter divisions and the paragraph divisions are shown by the insertion of spaces. It is replete with errors, especially of Hebrew grammar and syntax – gender and number concord are alien to this scribe! Nevertheless, the manuscript is of interest for the later history of the recensions in the Middle Ages. I will occasionally incorporate information from it in the commentary.

8.3 The Short Recension

K: the Italian semi-cursive script of this manuscript is clearly written and mostly legible – apart from the occasional problem of deciding between Bet and Kaph. There are a series of marginal notes to the first eight paragraphs of the text intro-

[64] Fols. 2a–3b of this Ms = F in the apparatus of the Short Recension.

[65] See, for example, the mess the scribe makes of §§ 32–34 (Langerman 1997: 59).

duced by נא'.[66] They seem to be in the same hand as that of the original scribe or one very similar. After § 8 the scribe seems to have given up the attempt to correct the manuscript except for the addition above the line in § 24 of a Mem missing from ומופלא; there are certainly other mistakes which he could have rectified! The text is liberally punctuated with dots and spaces. It has the five chapter division found in all the earlier Short Recension manuscripts: I (1–16), II (17–22), III (23–33), IV (37–44), V (45–64). Gruenwald (1971: 137) has already noticed the "close affinity" between K and Ms R. For example, they are the only two manuscripts to attest the addition שמהם נברא הכל in § 19. Again, K and R alone of the Short Recension manuscripts attest §§ 62–63, though this expansion of § 48b can be seen starting in the addition in that paragraph shared by MNFPIQ and by the interpolation of parts of §§ 62–63 in Ms Paris 763's form of 48b. R's colophon in § 64 is identical with part of that in K. But R cannot be simply a copy of K[67]. Note the shared readings of K and R in §§ 32–34 and see the notes to § 35.

L: L is a good, standard representative of the Short Recension, having a shorter text than Ms K. The fact that L, along with Ms S, does not attest § 48a is an important piece of evidence for the attempt to unravel the process of growth of §§ 48–49. See the notes to these paragraphs. L has the shortest colophon (§ 64) of all our manuscripts, indicating what is clear anyway, that the standard Aramaic form of this paragraph is no part of the earlier text.

MN: As Gruenwald (1971: 38) observes, "there are good reasons to believe that Ms. מ and נ were copied from the same prototype." They invariably combine together; note how, alone of the Short Recension manuscripts, they omit § 30. Their agreement in § 38 with the text cited by Judah ben Barzillai (Halberstam 1885: 120) may be significant – do we have here a Spanish/North African recension of SY? There is a manuscript closely related to them in the British Library (Or. 6577 – Cat. Margoliouth 736 (5), fols. 40a–43b), but it provides no readings of interest beyond those found in MN, so has not been included in the apparatus[68]. The *editio princeps* of the Short Recension (Mantua 1562 – ת' in Gruenwald's apparatus) often agrees with these manuscripts.

Links between MN and other Short Recension manuscripts can also be observed. Note the reading אחד shared with FP in § 48b, the addition shared with FPIQ in § 48b (the germ of § 63?), and the homoioteleuton shared in § 49 with FP. But the inter-relationships between the group MNFP are best seen in the form of § 50 which they alone attest except for the one minor variant shared by MN.

---

[66] For this scribal practice, which is similar to one use of the K^{e}tiv and the Q^{e}re in the Masoretic text of the Hebrew Bible, see Beit-Arié 1993c: 50.

[67] See the apparatus to §§ 62–63 and the notes on the text.

[68] In § 45 a reading from this Ms suggests that its common ancestor with M and N was probably illegible: for הרהור M has תרהור, N תדהור, and Or. 6577 הכהור.

Paris 763:1, fols. 1b–3a, is a fourteenth century Italian manuscript[69] with links to the kind of readings found in Mss MN but not exclusively so. Weinstock (1972: 26) used it for his edition of SY chapter 1 – his Ms ^{2}א. It is a poorly written manuscript with many errors and omissions so that sometimes I wondered whether the scribe really understood Hebrew. I have, accordingly, decided not to include its readings in the textual apparatus. However, given its relatively early date for a Short Recension manuscript I have referred to some of its more interesting readings in the textual notes. It is particularly interesting for the way in which it shows how §§ 62–63 grew out of the expansion of certain elements in § 48b.

S: Ms S is a standard representative of the Short Recension type of text. See above on L for its omission of § 48a. It is mostly carefully copied, though almost all of § 12 was omitted by parablepsis – from וחצב in § 12 to וחצב in § 13. It deviates sometimes from the standard Short Recension type of text under the influence of Long Recension readings.[70] Hence it seemed best to print its text separately from K in §§ 13, 16,17, though in § 56a it seemed the best representative of the Short Recension. See the notes to these paragraphs.

F: The scribe of this manuscript clearly had trouble (as we do) with the ambiguous meaning of רוח in the text and its overlap with אויר. See the notes to §§ 12 and 25. In § 16 he omits the word before אלהים חיים, hence leaving just the רוח which means "air." In § 14 he substitutes מרוח for ממים; in § 29 he substitutes רוח for רויה[71] so reproducing the reading רוח מרוח from § 12, while in § 32 רויה in the text is overwritten with רוח. There are a few other corrections in the margin and within the text itself. At the end of § 1 F adds והוא חשבון לב, forming an inclusion with the abbreviation for thirty-two (לב) with which it starts the paragraph. Note also the gloss added at the end of § 3.

P: There is some doubt about the date of this manuscript. The date given above is Gruenwald's but the Catalogue of the JNUL Microfilm Institute initially had fourteenth century but now has sixteenth century. It is probably appropriate then to refer to Colette Sirat's cautious words on the problem of dating manuscripts from their script alone, namely that the margin of error extends from at least fifty years to two hundred years or even more.[72] This manuscript has some interesting readings, notably its short text of § 1 which is very close to that of Ms Q. On five

---

[69] The date given is that of the Collective catalogue of the Microfilm Institute of JNUL but Zotenberg 1866: 124 dates it to 1284: "les neuf premiers ouvrages ont été écrits par Jonathan, fils d'Abi'ézer Kohen, de Ferrare, qui a terminé sa copie le 12 iyyar 5044 (1284 de J.C.)."

[70] Note Gruenwald's comment on this Ms: "one can detect in Ms. ס an attempt to reintegrate some of the readings of the long recension into the short one" (1971: 137).

[71] Note how the reading of Mss AB^{1}H in this paragraph identifies רויה with רוח.

[72] *Hebrew Manuscripts of the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2002), p. 267.

occasions I will use Ms P as one of the base manuscripts for the Short Recension: §§ 1, 15, 42, 50 and 63.

There are three additions to the basic text provided by the scribe of this manuscript and the way they are recorded seems to represent his attempt to classify this extra material. The addition to § 48b which I have printed as part of § 63 is actually incorporated in the text of the manuscript after 48b but introduced with ובסא' (= and in another text) and concluded with עכ' (= up to this point). In the margin alongside § 6 we find the Long Recension reading cited again as סא'. Presumably the fact that it is placed in the margin and not in the main text like the addition to § 48b indicates its lesser status. Finally alongside §§ 33–34 we find the missing permutations of letters אמש but this time recorded as פי' (interpretation).

I: Ms I has many peculiar readings which are mostly errors and have not, therefore, been recorded in the textual apparatus.

Q:[73] This is a carelessly written manuscript with many mistakes corrected by the original scribe. It does, however, offer one of the shortest versions of the Short Recension. See, in particular, its form of § 1. Alone among the Short Recension manuscripts it omits § 2 with all the Long Recension manuscripts except D. According to his note at the end of § 64 the scribe seems to have thought (erroneously) that he was copying SY in the arrangement of Saadya Gaon. Gruenwald's note 1 to § 9 is incorrect since Q does have this paragraph.

R: For the textual affinities of Ms R see above on K. For its two versions of § 17 see the notes to that paragraph. §§ 62–63 are written in the form of an inverted cone which eventually narrows down to the last word of § 63 – אמת, and then the colophon follows written once again across the page. Does this layout relate to the dubious status of these two paragraphs in the Short Recension?[74] See the notes to these paragraphs.

Apart from the few indications given above of links between these Short Recension manuscripts I cannot discern enough inter-relationships to enable me to construct a manuscript tree, so I have refrained from the attempt. Maybe collating all the 131 manuscripts of SY listed in the Catalogue of the Hebrew University Microfilm Institute would make such a chart possible. I am not convinced that the effort would be worthwhile, especially in the light of Malachi Beit-Arié's reservations mentioned earlier.

[73] This is the sole Ms of which I have been unable to obtain a microfilm or photograph and am, therefore, reliant on a single collation done in the Microfilm Institute of the JNUL in 1985.

[74] The layout of Ms I at its end would caution against such a conjecture since it narrows § 61 down in the same way to a single word.

9. The Chapter and Paragraph Divisions (Appendix II)[75]

The order in which the contents of SY are arranged is a crucial factor in assigning manuscripts to the different recensions and in plotting their interrelationships. It is similarly an instantaneous clue to the nature of the manuscript or manuscripts with which the commentators are working. In addition it tells us how the transmitters of the SY tradition had understood the structure of the work or how they reshaped it according to their own predilections. The table in Appendix II and the corresponding table of attestions in Appendix I will be fundamental tools for developing the commentary on the text.

All the manuscripts except C and D divide up the text into chapters. Some go further and attempt a numbered paragraph division as well. The earliest division seems to be into four chapters – Mss AB^2G. Later comes a division into five chapters[76] – Mss B^1HKLSR; still later we find a six-chapter division as reflected in the first printed editions of SY – Mss MNFPIQ. The Saadyan Recension has its own distinctive division into eight chapters, but the Genizah Scroll (C) is divided into neither chapters nor paragraphs, Ms E only into chapters, while it is Ms Z (containing Saadya's commentary) which has a full division into chapters and numbered paragraphs – possibly the work of Saadya himself.[77] The Short and Long Recension manuscripts all begin chapter II in the same place – after § 16. All except G begin chapter III with § 23 and chapter IV with § 37. Thereafter divisions between the manuscripts multiply. Mss A and B^2 have no further chapter divisions while the rest begin a new chapter at § 45 (where G begins its chapter IV). Those with a six-chapter division make another break at § 58.

The divisions mostly reflect a logical ordering of the material in the text. §§ 1–16 deal with the ten *sefirot*; §§ 17–22 provide a general introduction to the role of the letters in creation; §§ 23–36 deal with the "three mothers" (אמש) and §§ 37–44 with the "seven double letters" (בגדכפרת). But where does the section dealing with the "twelve simple letters" (הוזחטילנסעצק) end? There is no clear conclusion to this section and SY tails off into a series of paragraphs which attempt to draw the work to a conclusion but which are cluttered up with various later additions to the text. The six manuscripts which have the six chapter division clearly took § 56a (all they have of § 56) as winding up the previous chapter, and § 58 as beginning the next; they do not have § 57. We will deal with the Saadyan chapter and paragraph order in connection with our discussion of the origin of the recensions.

---

[75] On this see Gruenwald 1971: 138–39, especially footnote 24 on p. 139.

[76] Judah ben Barzillai informs us that this was in his day the chapter division found in most forms of the text (Halberstam 1885: 105). He mentions other versions which mess it up (מערבים אותו) – presumably a covert reference to the Saadyan Recension.

[77] So Haberman 1946/7: 242.

10. The Four Pre-Kabbalistic Commentaries

The problems of using commentaries as an aid to the reconstruction and edition of the texts on which they are commenting are well known to scholars. There is first of all the necessity of reconstructing the text of the commentaries themselves, since only rarely are they available in reliable critical editions. We then have to face the possibility, perhaps even the certainty, that as scribes copy the text of these commentaries they will update the text being commented on to that with which they are familiar in their own time. Fortunately, this will sometimes produce a discrepancy between the text cited in the lemmas and the text which the commentator is clearly addressing.[78] We will see this to be the case in at least two instances in Saadya's commentary. Then there is the possibility that the commentator has concluded that the text he has before him is corrupt and he has amended it without any manuscript support. Again, we will need to confront this problem in relation to Saadya's commentary. But at least Saadya usually tells us when he is doing this. Are other commentators as honest?

In the light of these problems why use the commentaries at all? In the case of SY the answer must be that the commentaries give us a fixed point of reference in the development of the text. So many of our manuscripts have to be dated by script and codicological criteria alone but for our three tenth century commentaries (Saadya, Dunash ben Tamim, Shabbetai Donnolo) we have precise dates of composition. And each of them attests one of our three basic recensions. Dunash's commentary is particularly valuable because it attests the state of the Short Recension in the tenth century when our earliest manuscript of this recension (Ms K) dates to 1286. As we saw at the beginning of this introduction our commentators are also well aware of the problems with the text of SY and can throw valuable light on the factors responsible for it. The reservations stated above mean that it would be inadvisable to do, as Weinstock does, and incorporate the text of the commentaries into the apparatus of a critical edition. But they are invaluable aids for reconstructing the history of the text and hence will be extensively used in my notes to the text.

I have confined my use of commentaries to those which belong to Joseph Dan's "second phase" in the history of SY,[79] that is, before SY was taken over by the Kabbalists in the course of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Moreover, my concern in this edition is not with the content of the commentaries on SY but only with their

[78] A striking example of this is the Arabic commentary on SY edited by Paul Fenton in *Mas'at Moshe: Studies in Jewish and Islamic Culture presented to Moshe Gil*, ed. E. Fleischer and M. Friedman (Jerusalem), 164–183. In this case the Hebrew text which precedes the commentary is completely different from the one translated and interpreted in the commentary. Fenton conjectures that it was added to the manuscript after the work of translation had been done from another Hebrew text of SY (*ibid.* 165).

[79] See his "Three phases of the History of *Sefer Yezira*", in his *Jewish Mysticism*, vol. I (1998), 155–187.

testimony to the state of its text. From time to time their views on the meaning of the text will be taken into account but only when they bear on the issue of the state and development of its text.

10.1 The Commentary of Saadya Gaon

This commentary, written in 931 C.E.,[80] has been much studied from the point of view of its position very near the beginning of Jewish medieval philosophy and as one of the earliest writings of the Gaon.[81] But far less attention has been paid to it as a witness to the text of SY. We have already referred above to the editions of the Arabic text but the full utilisation of this commentary for text-critical purposes would be greatly enhanced if we also had available editions of its early Hebrew translations. Malter (1921: 356–57) postulates the existence of at least four Hebrew translations. Judah ben Barzillai in his commentary on SY quotes extensively from two of them and probably knew of two more. Haberman (1946/7: 47) prints the introduction to the commentary from a Munich manuscript of Moses b. Joseph of Lucerne's translation placed in parallel columns alongside the extracts cited by Judah (Halberstam 1885: 268–274). There is a need for the kind of detailed attention to the textual tradition of Saadya's work that, as we shall see, Georges Vajda has devoted to Dunash ben Tamim's commentary.

Apart, then, from the usual problem of utilising commentaries for text-critical editions – namely, the problem of first fixing their own textual history, another major problem confronts us in the case of Saadya's commentary. How reliable is he as a transmitter of the text of SY? The first scholar to directly address this question – A. Epstein, was firmly of the view that Saadya created his own version of SY and that the history of the Saadyan Recension starts with him: "Saadja lag nicht etwa von den bekannten beiden Recensionem verschiedene vor, sondern er redigierte das Jezira-Buch nach seinem Gutdünken, und verlieh ihm eine neue Gestalt".[82] However, Saadya himself says explicitly that the arrangement of the text as he received it was put into writing at the same time as the Mishnah: פוקעת פיה הד׳ה אלאבעאץ׳ מן אלפואסיק והד׳ה אלנט׳אם מן אלכלאם (there came about at this (time) parts of the paragraphs and the arrangement of the words).[83] Saadya seems

[80] Saadya provides us with the precise date of composition – Kafach 1972: 86, Lambert 1891: 52.

[81] See H. Malter, *Saadya Gaon: His Life and Works* (New York, 1921), 177–193, 356–359, G. Vajda, "Sa'adya commentateur du 'Livre de la Création'," *Annuaire de l'Ecole Pratique des Hautes Études, Sciences Religieuses* (Paris), 3–35, Haggai ben-Shammai, "Saadya's Goal in his *Commentary on Sefer Yezira*", in *A Straight Path – Studies in Medieval Philosophy and Culture: Essays in Honor of Arthur Hyman*, ed. R. Link-Salinger, 1988, 1–9, and Raphael Jospe, "Early Philosophical Commentaries on the *Sefer Yezirah*: Some Comments", *REJ* 149, 369–415.

[82] Epstein 1893: 119. Joseph Dan also accepts this view of Saadya's role in the creation of the Saadyan Recension (1998: 184–85).

[83] Kafach 1972: 33, l. 3 from bottom, Lambert 1891: 13, ll.1–2).

to be accepting here that material was added to the previously orally transmitted SY at the time that it was put into writing but that the order of the material was henceforth fixed. In the paragraph which follows this statement[84] Epstein (ibid.) takes the word נת׳בת in the phrase פנרי אן נת׳בת מנה הלכה הלכה עלי תמאמהא to mean "fix" (the text).[85] This would be in conflict with what Saadya has just said about the order of the words being "fixed" at the time of the writing down of the Mishnah. It seems to me that Saadya is referring here to his practice of writing out the full Hebrew text of each lemma in what he regards as the correct text before commenting on it, and he does this in view of the problems created by the long history of oral transmission which he postulates for the text of SY. He is admitting to choosing the text which he regards as the best one but not to composing his own version. If he felt able to do what Epstein suggests he would not have admitted on occasions that the text he had before him was wrong. He would have just altered it and kept quiet. Epstein takes Saadya's comment on § 12 (his ch. 4:2)[86] to be admitting that he was rearranging the text to produce a more logical order. I would understand Saadya at this point to be just trying to discern the logic of the arrangement he inherited – with §§ 9 and 17 following on from § 12. As I hope that I have demonstrated in the notes to the text of SY, a history of the text which posits first the Short Recension, then the Long Recension, and then the Saadyan Recension created from a rearrangement of the Long Recension, is too simple and uncomplicated for the confusing textual data we have. There are too many instances where the Saadyan Recension seems to take us back to a form of SY which predates even the Short Recension.

Israel Weinstock has made a strong case that the Genizah Scroll of SY (Ms C) was copied from the sort of text that Saadya had before him and not from his commentary.[87] He calls in evidence first the doublets which are found in the commentary but not in the Scroll – §§ 37b and 56a. Saadya's comments show that these were present in the text before him but the Scroll only has these paragraphs where they are logically required. Ms E agrees with the Scroll. The logical inference is that these doublets were added in after the recension was constructed, with the better text descending through the Scroll to Ms E and the inferior text coming before Saadya. Then Weinstock cites two paragraphs where Saadya proclaims in error readings which appear in the Scroll – §§ 19 and 54.[88] Ms E agrees with the Scroll in § 19 but in § 54.3 has a different reading from both of them. We might add to Weinstock's list here the case of § 47 where Saadya proclaims incorrect precisely the reading which appears in the Scroll. It seems highly unlikely that a scribe copying from Saadya's commentary would accept exactly the readings which Saadya

[84] Kafach 1972: 34, l.5, Lambert 1891: 13, l.5).

[85] See the translations of Kafach and Lambert cited above in footnote 2.

[86] Kafach 1972: 110, Lambert 1891: 73).

[87] להבהרת אופיו וגילגוליו של ספר יצירה שב"נוסח רס"ג", *Temirin*, II, 34–37.

[88] See the notes to these paragraphs.

has deemed to be incorrect. Finally, Weinstock points out that the Scroll has none of the chapter or paragraph divisions that Saadya found (or inserted?) in his text. As we have seen, Ms E has the chapter divisions but not the paragraphs. It seems clear, then, that the Scroll, supported by Ms E, shows rather decisively that the Saadyan Recension was not the work of Saadya himself but of an editor much earlier in the chain of transmission.

But if we accept that Saadya was not actually the creator of the Recension which has come to bear his name, can we rely on him to have faithfully transmitted the text he did receive and, further, how far can we rely on Ms Z to have transmitted accurately the Hebrew text of SY which Saadya embedded in his commentary? Can we be sure that the text it transmits has not been "improved" in the three hundred and thirty one years since it left the Gaon's pen? There are a few occasions where it seems clear that Saadya is working from a different Hebrew text than the one contained in Ms Z. See, for example, § 2 where he comments as though the word יסוד was present in his text though it is not in Ms Z – or CE for that matter. His translation and comment on § 12[89] seem to presuppose the text found in Mss CE and not that in Ms Z. Nor can Saadya's translation into Arabic of the Hebrew text on which he is commenting be a secure basis for reconstructing the Hebrew text he had before him since what he offers is often the "meaning" of the text or just a paraphrase. See, for example, what he does with § 17 (Kafach 1972: 110, Lambert 1891: 74). Moreover, we do know that Saadya was occasionally unhappy about the text which he had and felt the need to correct it, most notably in § 19 where he corrected the number of "gates" from 221 to 231. At least here he tells us what he has done. In § 54.3 he knows of two variant readings, one of which is the reading of Ms C that he declares erroneous. Did he alter the reading to תתרות which he declares is the correct one?[90] In the case of § 47 it is not inconceivable that Saadya found sixteen "diagonal lines" in his text as we find them in Ms C and corrected them to twelve. But Ms Z has eleven! Presumably there were twelve when the text left Saadya's hands. All in all, these few indications mean that Saadya's commentary (and with it Ms Z) have to be treated with some caution as witnesses to the text of SY.[91] Hence the importance of Mss C and E as independent witnesses to the text of the Saadyan Recension. It is probably time to dethrone Ms Z from its role hitherto as the primary witness to this recension.

[89] See the notes to this paragraph.

[90] Kafach 1972: 140, Lambert 1891: 102–03.

[91] Note also what Haberman says: גם כאן אנו רואים את הגאון כמבקר גדול שאינו נרתע לתקן טכסט כשהוא בטוח בתיקונו ואפילו כשכל כתבי היד מעידים כנגדו (1946/7: 242).

[92] See Colette Sirat, *A History of Jewish Philosophy in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge 1990),

10.2 The Commentary of Dunash Ibn Tamim

Dunash Ibn Tamim from Kairouan (c.890 C.E. to after 955/6) was a pupil of the Jewish neo-Platonic philosopher, Isaac Israeli.[92] In 955/6 C.E. he wrote a commentary on SY primarily in order to counteract what he regarded as the errors in Saadya's commentary.[93] In a series of articles published in REJ between 1939 and 1963 Georges Vadja gave extensive consideration to this commentary. His work on this text has now been collected and re-published with extensive corrections and additions by Paul Fenton (= Vadja-Fenton 2002). Three-quarters of Dunash's original Arabic text have been preserved in the Cairo Genizah (in fragments now in Cambridge and St Petersburg); we are awaiting a definitive edition of them by Paul Fenton. At least five Hebrew translations were made during the Middle Ages. Vadja has argued that in the course of transmission these have contaminated each other in a way which can no longer be disentangled.[94] Two of these translations are available in critical editions – that of Moses ben Joseph (dating from the second half of the twelfth century)[95] and that of an anonymous author of unknown date based on an abridgement made from the original Arabic text possibly of 1092.[96]

There is some confusion in the manuscripts over the authorship of this commentary and, besides Dunash, it has been attributed to his teacher Isaac Israeli, to Jacob ben Nissim of Kairouan (died 1007), and even to Abraham Ibn Ezra. The St Petersburg fragment of the Arabic text attributes it to the head of a Palestinian academy, Judah ha-Kohen.[97] It is quite possible that Isaac Israeli did write a commentary on SY which is now lost, parts of which Dunash could have incorporated in his own work. At one point Dunash quotes a comment of Isaac which also appears in Saadya's commentary but attributed to an anonymous source.[98] However the commentary we have cannot be the work of Isaac since the author refers to him as his teacher in the preface. Fenton considers it possible that Jacob ben Nissim wrote a

57–68 and A. Altmann and S.M. Stern, *Isaac Israeli: A Neoplatonic Philosopher of the Early Tenth Century* (Oxford 1958).

[93] See the preface to his commentary (G. Vadja, G. and P.B. Fenton, *Le Commentaire sur le Livre de la Création de Dūnaš ben Tāmīn de Kairouan (Xe siècle): Nouvelle édition revue et augmentée par Paul B. Fenton* (Paris-Louvain, 2002), p. 39, Hebrew text on p. 214. The Hebrew translations tend to tone down Dunash's criticisms of Saadya. For the date see his comment on SY § 7 and Vajda's note on the complex problems of the textual variants in the Mss for this date *(ibid.* 58–61).

[94] *Ibid.* 28–30.

[95] *Ibid.* 211–248.

[96] M. Grossberg, *Sefer Yezirah ascribed to the Patriarch Abraham with commentary by Dunash Ben Tamim* (London 1902). Fenton argues that Jehuda b. Barzillai cites Dunash's commentary from this abbreviated version (Vadja-Fenton 2002: 35, n.108).

[97] See Paul Fenton's introduction to Vajda-Fenton 2002:11 and Fenton 1988: 46–47.

[98] Vajda-Fenton 2002: 16. The text is in Grossberg 1902: 22 and Kafach 1972: 74–5, Lambert 1891: 42.

[99] *Ibid.* 7.

commentary on SY (now lost) that was later confused with Dunash's work.[99] The confusion with Abraham Ibn Ezra may have arisen because he might have been one of the earliest translators of Dunash's book. Vajda and Fenton together have demonstrated conclusively that the commentary is Dunash's own work but that it encapsulates the view of SY taken by the school of Kairouan; hence Vadja's title for the work: *"le commentaire Kairouanais."*

Dunash's commentary is our earliest witness to the existence of the Short Recension of SY.[100] The text cited in the commentary agrees on the whole with our best manuscripts of this recension and may, on occasion, take us back even earlier in its transmission history than they do. The Hebrew text on which Dunash is commenting is clearly distinguished from the commentary and does not appear to have suffered from intervention by Dunash himself. A good case could now be made for including it within the apparatus of an edition of SY. However, unlike Saadya's commentary where we have at least two manuscripts (C and E) which are almost (but not quite) identical with the Hebrew text embedded in it, no Short Recension manuscript resembles Dunash's text as closely as this. As we shall see in the notes on the text, Dunash generally seems to have had an even shorter text than that represented in our best Short Recension manuscripts. I have, therefore, confined my use of this commentary to the textual notes where, however, it is invaluable in my attempt to reconstruct the history of the text of SY. The task is immeasurably aided by Fenton's re-edition of Vajda's translations of the commentary in the light of all the textual data which we now possess – especially the large portion of the original Arabic text.

The existence of the Short Recension is also attested in the mid-eleventh century by Moshe Ha-Darshan of Narbonne. In the first paragraph of his *Bereshit Rabbati*[101] he cites SY §§ 19a (agreeing with the text of Mss KAD), § 39 (exactly as K), § 43a (closest to Mss SFI), § 42 (agreeing with Ms A except for reading פעמים instead of ימים with the Short Recension Mss KSFPIR), § 38 (closest to Ms K), and finally § 37 (exactly as Ms K except for omitting דגש ורפי along with nearly all the Short Recension manuscripts). However, it is unsafe to rely on this work as a witness to the text of SY because the editor, Chaim Albeck, only had available a copy of the Prague manuscript on which he based his edition and was unable to see the original manuscript. Nor was he able to give a date for the manuscript, though he seems to suggest that it postdated the invention of printing (1940: 36). However, the readings we have reveal clear affinities with the Short Recension, as does the order § 43a followed by § 42[102]. An indication of the high status Moshe accorded to SY as a source of tradition from at least the rabbinic period is the formula דתנינן with which he introduces these quotations.

[100] See Epstein 1893: 458.

[101] C. Albeck, *Midraš Berešit Rabbati ex libro R. Mosis Haddaršan* (Jerusalem 1940), text, pp. 1–2.

[102] See the table in Appendix II.

10.3 The Ḥakhemoni *of Shabbetai Donnolo*

Shabbetai Donnolo (913 – after 982) came from Oria in South Italy, part way between the ports of Taranto and Brindisi, major terminals of the trade routes to the eastern Mediterranean. His commentary on SY – the *Ḥakhemoni*, was written between 946 and 982, probably nearer the latter.[103] Donnolo's work on SY is not comparable to that of Saadya and Dunash. He is primarily interested only in parts of SY – mainly those which can be interpreted as containing, esoteric, astrological doctrine. Large parts of SY are either recorded without comment or with paraphrastic additions inserted into the base text. This makes it difficult at times to isolate the text of SY which Donnolo had before him from his own comments on it.

We have already referred to A. Epstein's identification of the Long Recension (Mantua II in his terminology) as the SY text with which Donnolo was working.[104] But Epstein goes further and sees Donnolo's commentary as the actual source of the Long Recension, in the same way that he sees Saadya's commentary as the source of his eponymous recension. Neither conclusion is now tenable. The text of SY contained in the *Ḥakhemoni* is certainly the Long Recension but it is by no means identical with the near contemporaneous Ms A. See, for example, SY § 20 where it is clear that the text found in Mss A and B^2 is presupposed in Donnolo's commentary but his commentary cannot be their source. The *Ḥakhemoni* does not have § 62 against all the Long Recension manuscripts, so where did they get it from if Donnolo's work was their source? Many other examples could be supplied to show that Donnolo's version of the Long Recension was not identical with the one we have in our manuscripts. However, the way in which he handles the text of SY certainly throws a lot of light on the process by which the Long Recension emerged.

There are complications about using the text of the *Ḥakhemoni* to throw light on the textual history of SY. David Castelli, in his 1880 edition,[105] used four Italian manuscripts, but Ithamar Gruenwald is scathing about the quality of his work.[106] The Catalogue of the JNUL Microfilm Institute lists twenty-three manuscripts of Donnolo's *Ḥakhemoni*, many of them in libraries outside Italy. A proper critical edition would need to take in the evidence of them all, and even then would be subject to the vagaries of fate and scribal intervention which we discussed earlier. Sharf (Appendix A, pp. 155–158) provides some information on the manuscripts of the *Ḥakhemoni* and the areas where he felt that Castelli's edition required supplementation, but his interest was in Donnolo's astrology and anthropology and he does not deal with his work as a source for the textual history of SY. This commentary, then, will certainly need to be handled with the usual "health warnings".

---

[103] See Andrew Sharf, *The Universe of Shabbetai Donnolo* (Warminster 1976), p. 11.

[104] See Epstein 1893: 458–462.

[105] *Il commento di Sabbatai Donnolo sul libro della creazione.*

[106] "Unfortunately Castelli's edition of Donnolo's commentary to *SY*, should not be consulted without checking the manuscripts he used!" (1973: 483).

10.4 The Commentary of Rabbi Judah ben Barzillai

Judah ben Barzillai of Barcelona was active in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries.[107] His massive and immensely detailed commentary was written about the middle of the twelfth century, according to Joseph Dan.[108] It is based, like Dunash's, on the Short Recension though he knew the Long Recension, as Epstein was the first to point out.[109] Usually, he classifies Long Recension readings as commentary material which he found in some versions.[110] His primary source was Saadya's commentary and secondarily Dunash's[111] but he seems to refer to Shabbetai Donnolo's work anonymously.[112] Judah builds on the view of the origins of SY which is presented by Saadya at the conclusion of the introduction to his commentary. Saadya, as we have seen, had postulated an oral tradition of the laws of creation (הילכות יצירה) descending from Abraham and only written down at the same time as the Mishnah. Judah seems to extend this period of oral transmission to the time of the Gaonim – at least that is how Dan understands his rather vague statements on this point.[113] Judah seems to classify SY with the talmudic *baraitot*, *Siphre de-beRav* and the *Hekhalot* texts. He sees it as only one remnant of a once larger collection of הילכות יצירה. The state of its text is not, then, a great surprise to him. Judah's reasons for writing such an extensive commentary on SY (three hundred and fifty-four pages in Halberstam's edition) have been carefully studied by Joseph Dan;[114] we will need to return to these later since, as we shall see, much the same motivation lies behind the expansion of the text of SY as we go from the Short to the Long Recension.

Unfortunately, only one manuscript of Judah's commentary has survived – in Padua. It was edited by S.J. Halberstam in 1885.[115] However, his work required a large series of corrections which are supplied as an appendix by David Kaufmann but it is still regarded as unreliable.[116] Again, as with the other commentaries we

---

[107] I.M. Ta-Shma, *EJ*, X: 341–42.

[108] פירוש ספר יצירה לר' יהודה בן ברזילי הברצלוני – אופיו ומגמותיו in *Masuut: Studies in Kabbalah and Jewish Thought in Memory of Ephrayim Gottlieb*, ed. M. Oron and A. Goldreich (Jerusalem 1994), p. 102.

[109] 1893: 459.

[110] See, for example, his comments cited in the notes to § 1.

[111] Dan 1994: 105. Judah cites Saadya's work frequently throughout his commentary and includes at the end an extensive excerpt from one (no longer extant) Hebrew translation of it (Halberstam 1885: 268–278).

[112] So Epstein 1893: 459, n.3.

[113] See Halberstam 1885: 101 and Dan 1994: 115.

[114] 1994: 99–119.

[115] *Commentar zum Sepher Jezira von R. Jehuda b. Barsilai* (Berlin).

[116] למרות התיקונים הרבים,הטקסט עדיין משובש עד מאוד, וראוי להוצאה מחודשת ומתוקמת (Dan 1994: 99, n.1). There is a similar negative judgement on Halberstam's work by Ithamar Gruenwald (1973: 482). He reports that the manuscript was then in the possession of Professor Nehemiah Allony in Jerusalem who let him examine it.

will need to pay close attention to the text that Judah appears to be commenting on as a check on the text cited in his lemmas. Judah's commentary is particularly valuable for the wide range of evidence he brings to his discussion of the text of SY and his apparent awareness of the reasons for the differences between the sources he had.

11. The Earliest Recoverable Text of Sefer Yeṣira and the Three Recensions

In Appendix III I have summarised the results of my investigations into the text of SY by printing what I have chosen to call the "earliest recoverable text of SY." By this I mean the text on the basis of which it is possible to explain how most of the variant texts now in the recensions and manuscripts arose. Often, but not always, it will be the lowest common denominator of our available texts – what they all have in common. It also, almost invariably, turns out to be the shortest text we have. There are a few occasions where we can guess why a scribe might want to shorten the text he had before him – for example, Ms K's elimination of the permutations of יהוה in § 15, but nearly always it is easier to think of reasons why scribes expanded the text. As we have seen, we certainly have the support of the earliest commentators for assuming this to be the case for SY. There is only one case where I am inclined to suspect that part of the text was cut out for theological reasons – § 60b in the Saadyan Recension. Otherwise, scribes altered the ideological orientation of the text by means of supplementation and, if that produced internal inconsistencies, it did not seem to worry them.[117]

My "earliest recoverable text" is not to be taken as synonymous with the "original text" of SY. It has been created as a theoretical exercise in order to try to penetrate into the processes which led to the formation of the multitudinous texts of SY which have come down to us. We have no reason to presume that these processes had not been in operation prior to the period to which the manuscripts give us access. Penetrating into that period does become highly speculative and obviously passes over the borderline between textual and literary/source criticism. I am thinking here, for example, of Ithamar Gruenwald's speculations that §§ 1–16 and §§ 17–63 were originally separate works artificially bound together by material like the introductory § 1.[118] Issues like that will be of concern for a subsequent work to this one.

Appendix IV contains the full text of Ms A with the material which is additional to my "earliest recoverable text" underlined. Ms A contains virtually the whole of

[117] See the quotation from Emmanuel Tov cited in the general note on §§ 39–44.
[118] See Gruenwald 1973.

the SY tradition. By analysing this supplementary material we can get a good idea of how and why the text of SY was subject to such continuous scribal activity. This supplementary material can be classified under the following heads:

11.1 The Biblical Material in Sefer Yeṣira[119]

The biblical content in our "earliest recoverable text" is very minimal. We have explicit citations with the requisite introductory formulae only in § 5 (Ezek 1:14) and § 14 (Ps 104:4). Part of Qoh 7:14 is quoted without an introductory formula in § 60b – but this is absent in the Saadyan Recension.[120] Otherwise, we have only a tiny handful of allusions: Job 26:7 in the word בלימה (§§ 3–10), Ezek 1:14 again in § 8, one word of Gen 1:1 and two of Isa 57:20 in § 13, a faint echo of Isa 45:7 in § 37b (probably itself a later addition), an allusion to Isa 64:3 in § 40, and that is all. All other biblical references are not attested in one or more of our sources. The added biblical material can be found in §§ 1, 10, 13, 38, 47, 56, and 61.[121] It goes without saying that scribes are more likely to add biblical material than leave it out. However, I do not see that the scarcity of biblical material in the earliest layer of the SY tradition provides any grounds for the impossibly early mid-first century C.E. date proposed by Yehuda Liebes (2000: 229–300).

11.2 The Rabbinic Material

Apart from the fact that it is written in Hebrew, that it alludes to the Temple in § 38, and that it refers allusively in the final paragraph (61) to Abraham's strange experience recorded in Genesis 15, there is little on the surface which is Jewish in our "earliest recoverable text" of SY. As Ithamar Gruenwald has well said, "the book occupies a kind of spiritual isolation, that is positively unique in the history of Hebrew literature" (1973: 477). It does not mention Moses or his Torah, the Messiah or life after death, and it does not claim any pseudonymous authority. The people of Israel are not mentioned; the author's concern is with human beings as such (נפש), men and women, not Jews in particular. For him the number twelve conjures up the twelve signs of the zodiac, not the twelve tribes of Israel.[122] Its epistemology, as seen in § 61, sidelines revelation in favour of empirical observation – presumably one of the reasons why it was such an attractive basis for their

[119] This material has been investigated in much greater detail in Hayman 1984.

[120] See the notes to § 60 for the reasons why I think it may still be part of our "earliest recoverable text."

[121] See the table in Hayman (*ibid.*), p. 179.

[122] Contrast *Tanḥuma Wayʿḥi* 17: "But it [Scripture] arranged the tribes according to the order of the world. The day has twelve hours, the night twelve hours, the year twelve months, the signs of the zodiac are twelve. Therefore all the tribes of Israel are twelve" (ed. S. Buber, Vilna 1885, vol. I, p. 221).

own speculations of our tenth century commentators.[123] Part of the function of the Long Recension additions is clearly to mitigate this strangeness of SY and to pull it back from the periphery to the centre of the ongoing rabbinic version of Judaism. The additions initiate the process, continued in the commentaries, of smoothing over the evident contradiction between the worldview of SY and that of Scripture and Talmud, especially with regard to the process of creation, but also in regard to epistemology.[124] The whole feel of the text is different when we move from Appendix III to Appendix IV.

Obviously the addition of the biblical material discussed above is one element which makes the difference. But there are many other additions which give the text much more of the feel of the rabbinic and midrashic texts. The difference can be seen immediately in the text of § 1 with the insertion of the long list of divine names and titles. Now the creator becomes the "God of Israel." We find the same list of names in § 56 which is too weakly attested to be assigned to our "earliest recoverable text." In §§ 3 and 61 the additions bring the covenant of circumcision into the text and stress the connection between God, Abraham and his descendants. There is a clearly discernible layer of glosses drawn from talmudic material in *b. Ḥag.* 12 and *y. Ḥag.* 77; see §§ 13, 14, 43b, 47 and 56. The literary structure of §§ 32–34, 41 and 52 seems designed to call to mind the famous story in *b. Men.* 29b of Moses ascent to heaven and his observation of God tying crowns to the Torah. Other midrashic material can be observed in the glosses in §§ 38 and 56. Finally in §§ 38, 47, 48, 56 and 57 I have attempted to show that there "is a series of additions to the core text of SY which attempt to restructure its cosmology in line with that presupposed in the Hekhalot literature and other talmudic material."[125]

11.3 Creatio ex Nihilo *in Sefer Yeṣira*

The predominant image in SY of God as creator is that of the artist working on pre-existent materials. This is clearly presupposed in the constant use of the verbs חקק and חצב and also צר/יצר. We know that this was a problem for its early interpreters. It comes, therefore, as no surprise that a layer of glosses can be detected that attempt to correct SY's view of the creative process in the direction of *creatio ex nihilo*.[126] This is directly observable in the text of § 20 where we will see that many scribes have had a hand in rewriting the text. Less overtly it can be seen in

---

[123] I have investigated the epistemology of SY in greater detail and in comparison with Qohelet in Hayman 1991.

[124] Cf Joseph Dan, פירוש ספר יצירה לר' יהודה בן ברזילי הברצלוני – אופיו ומגמותיו, p. 119. The weak attestation of this material in the SY tradition undermines Yehuda Liebes's attempt, as against Dan, to argue for the throughgoing Jewish nature of SY; see Liebes 2000: 225.

[125] See Hayman 1987, especially pp. 78–80.

[126] See Hayman 1993 – "The Doctrine of Creation in Sefer Yesira: Some Text-Critical Problems."

the attempt to insert the verb ברא throughout the text and allow it to qualify חקק, חצב and צר/יצר. In no paragraph in SY is the verb ברא attested in all recensions and manuscripts. In § 1 the phrase ברא את עולמו is missing in Mss DPQ and the commentators Dunash ben Tamim and Judah ben Barzillai. In § 4 the gloss כי הוא יוצר ובורא לבדו ואין זולתו appears only in four Long Recension Mss. In § 19b only the Short Recension Mss K and R have the phrase שמהם נברא הכל. This phrase recurs in § 24 but only in the Saadyan Recension. However, the most blatant example of this attempt to correct the text of SY is found in the quotation from Qoh 7:14 in § 60 where many manuscripts substitute ברא for the עשה of the biblical text. In the quotation from this text in § 48a all texts have עשה. In this way the potentially problematic view of creation in SY is adjusted to that which became the norm in medieval Judaism.

11.4 The Astrological Material in Sefer Yeṣira

Apart from the possible reference to the nodes of the moon in the word תלי in §§ 55 and 59,[127] there is only one clear astrological reference in SY, in § 42: "And with them were carved out seven firmaments, seven earths, *seven hours* and seven days." The seven hours refers to the allocation of each hour of the day, in sequences of seven, to the seven planetary bodies – the system which gives rise to our names of the days of the week.[128] The allocation is crucial for the operation of astrology because it tells us which planetary body is dominant at the time of any particular event. However, none of the other paragraphs in SY which describe which object was created by each of the seven letters (§§ 39, 41, 43, 44, 62) mentions the seven hours and, as Solomon Ganz has correctly observed the author of SY "connected the seven planets in the natural order of שצם חנכ'ל[129] ...with the first seven days instead of the first seven hours of creation". Ganz concludes that SY § 42 is "the

[127] See A.E. Harkavy, אתליא – תלי , *Ben-Ammi*, April/May, ed. Y.L. Kantor (St Petersberg 1887), 27–35, A. Sharf, *The Universe of Shabbetai Donnolo* (Warminster 1976), 33–51, and M. Schlüter, *"Deraqon" und Götzendienst* (Frankfurt 1982), 130–142. I agree with Epstein (1894: 64–65) and Séd, *La mystique cosmologique juive* (Paris 1981), 210, n.322, that תלי here refers to the *axis mundi*. See Hayman "The Dragon, the *Axis Mundi*, and *Sefer Yeṣira* § 59" (forthcoming).

[128] See Ganz, "The Origin of the Planetary Week *or* The Planetary Week in Hebrew Literature", Proceedings of the American Academy of Jewish Research, 18 (1948/9), 213–254, and T. Barton, *Ancient Astronomy* (London and New York: 1994), 52.

[129] i.e שבתי צדק מאדים חמה נוגה כוכב־חמה לבנה, whereas the Jewish form of the planetary hours (counting from the first hour of Sunday) requires the order חנכל שצם. See Sharf (1976: 28–9) for the headache this ordering in SY created for Shabbetai Donnolo.

[130] Ganz 1948/9: 238. Epstein 1894: 68, n.6 also regards SY § 42 as a late interpolation into the text.

gloss of a later editor who wished to reconcile the theory of the Book of Creation with the accepted theory of the planetary hour week."[130]

In the notes to §§ 39, 41–44, I have argued that the "earliest recoverable text" of SY contained only the Saadyan version of § 39. None of the material in §§ 41–44 is attested in all three recensions. One major motive for the creation of this material was to spell out the implications of the enigmatic § 39. But another was to make SY conform to later astrological orthodoxy, in line with the attempt Epstein identifies to give an astrological connotation to the word תלי in § 59.[131] The gloss in § 55 in Mss B[1]H (זהו תלי גדול המזלות) is an overt sign of a scribe wishing to emphasise this particular line of interpretation. But, more significantly, SY § 42 in the second form in which it appears in the Short Recension (i.e. after § 43a and before § 45), the Long Recension form of § 42, and the Short and Long Recension forms of § 43a belong to this later astrological reshaping of SY. Neither is present in the Saadyan Recension, and the alternative form of § 42 found directly after § 39 in most Short Recension manuscripts does not contain the phrase שבע שעות.

11.5 The Kabbalistic Readings and Additions

There is very little additional material in SY which can be allocated to scribes with an interest in its kabbalistic interpretation – Dan's "third phase" in its history.[132] Naturally, what few readings there are appear only in manuscripts dating from the fourteenth century onwards. The reading מדתו for מידתן in § 4 (Ms B[1]), § 6 (B[1]GH), and § 7 (G) seems designed to identify the ten *sefirot* as attributes of God. The readings צפייתו and ותכליתו in § 8 (B[1]) seem to have the same *tendenz*, as does the reading סופו בתחילתו ותחילתו בסופו in § 6 (G). Gruenwald (1973: 499) points out that the addition of the quotation from Ps 93:2 in § 10 provides ten words from נכון to ועד and this laid the text open to kabbalistic interpretation, identifying the names with the *sefirot*. The addition of the names of God in §§ 1 and 56 may reflect the same motivation.

11.6 The Commentary Material

The overwhelming majority of the additions to the text of SY reflect no ideological bias but are clarificatory and expository material – פרושים as they are often classified by the early commentators. These range from simple one word or phrase

[131] "C'est certainement ce dragon représentant l'axe du monde que notre S. Yecira désigne par le mot תלי et voilà pourquoi il lui asssigne un rang si important dans l'univers. Tel était probablement à l'origine le sens de תלי et cest seulement après que la conception du dragon lunaire eut pénétré dans les mileux juifs que ce mot prit d'autres significations et finalement celle de dragon lunaire" (1894: 64–65).

[132] Dan 1998. On the Lurianic edition of SY which takes this line of interpretation as given see Goldschmidt 1894: 25–26.

clarifications to whole paragraphs or larger complexes of material. They appear throughout the text but are concentrated towards its end; the bulk of them appear in the last three chapters of the Saadyan version. Some additions of this type appear in one manuscript only, some in one or more of the recensions, and some have, I would surmise, spread right across the whole textual tradition. These latter I enclose in square brackets in Appendix III.

An example of a gloss appearing in just one manuscript is the words שיצאתה ממנו in Ms A, § 5. This is clearly an attempt to explain the ambiguous word למקום which precedes them. For a set of single word glosses compare the text of § 39 in Appendices III and IV. The words בעולם, בשנה, and בנפש have been added after כוכבים, וימים, and ושערים to further stress the principle laid down in § 43c – "He split up the witnesses and made each one stand by itself – the universe by itself, the year by itself, mankind by itself." These additions in §§ 5 and 39 are relatively simple explanatory glosses with larger expansions of the same type appearing in §§ 17b, 37b, the §§ 48–49 complex, etc. But often the additional material reflects far more intrusive editorial motivations. For example, the Short Recension version of § 12 is a complete rewrite of the earlier form of the paragraph with the evident intention to integrate together the two separate parts of SY – §§ 1–16 dealing with the *sefirot*, and §§ 17–61 (63) dealing with the twenty-two letters, as Gruenwald has already suggested (1973: 498). In fact, many of the additions, especially in the Long Recension, seem to have this aim. §§ 2 and 9 seem to have been created for this purpose; without them, there would be no mention of the twenty-two letters in chapter one (§§ 1–16) of SY.

Two large complexes of material seem to have this integrative motive:

(1) §§ 32–24, 41, and 52, constructed on a fixed framework,[133] take further the explicatory and integrative purpose discernible behind the single word additions to § 39 and spell out in detail the evidence for the fundamental principle of § 43c. Neither §§ 41 nor 52 appear in the Short Recension or the commentaries of Dunash and Judah, and this casts a shadow over the possible presence of §§ 32–34 in the earlier stages of the SY text tradition. We have already seen above (in section 11.2) that the literary structure of this complex of material also serves the purpose of binding SY closer to the rabbinic tradition.

(2) §§ 36, 44 and 54 precisely parallel the content of §§ 32–34, 41 and 52 but cast their material into a different literary framework. Again none of this material appears in the Short Recension, Dunash or Judah. In the Saadyan Recension it appears in a single block at the beginning of Saadya's chapter eight. Israel Weinstock argues, possibly rightly, that this was the original arrangement of this material and only later was it split up and distributed in the Long Recension over the chapters dealing with the three separate groups of letters (1981: 44).

[133] See the notes to §§ 32–24.

The same evident purpose of spelling out the implications of the principle enunciated in § 43c seems to be behind § 62 which is missing in all but two of the Short Recension manuscripts, although present in the Long and Saadyan Recensions. Judah ben Barzillai explicitly labels it interpolated commentary material. § 57, also missing in the Short Recension and similarly labelled commentary material by Judah, shows another way of expressing this integrative motive, as does § 58b – missing in the Short Recension, Dunash and Judah.

Another type of expansion reflects none of these ideological or literary motivations and seems to be that most loosely attached to the SY text tradition – the numerical midrashic material which first appears in § 48b and is fully developed in § 63. In this case we have sufficient manuscript evidence to be able to demonstrate how § 63 grew out of what was probably a marginal note to § 48b.

§§ 27–31 are missing in the Saadyan Recension and I will give reasons in the notes to §§ 25 and 27 for surmising that they arose out of an attempt by scribes to deal with an internal contradiction which may have been present in the earlier text of SY. Harmonising additions are a common type of textual variant but here, as so often elsewhere, they actually make matters worse.

It is clear, then, that these additions were made to the text of SY out of multiple motives. Some do seem to reflect a disciplined and determined editorial intention (e.g. the two complexes of §§ 32–34, 41, 52 and 36, 44, and 54), but others are more ad hoc and incidental. Inevitably this means that any simple theory of how the text of SY developed must be ruled out of court.

12. The Three Recensions and the Development of the SY Text Tradition

We have already referred to Abraham Epstein's relatively simple explanation of how the recensions of SY arose. In his view, at the source stands the Short Recension while the Long Recension is simply the text of SY as extracted out of Shabbetai Donnolo's commentary, and the Saadyan Recension that found in Saadya's commentary. Gruenwald and Weinstock seem to agree that the Saadyan Recension was created out of the Long Recension but they differ as to who did it – Saadya himself according to Gruenwald, some earlier editor according to Weinstock.[134] Weinstock is almost certainly correct in arguing that Saadya did not create his eponymous recension and nor did the Long Recension come out of Donnolo's commentary. But the complex situation we have to face in commenting on the various manuscripts and recensions reveals that no simple solution is adequate to explain the evidence before us. The Saadyan Recension cannot just have been created out of the Long Recension either by Saadya or a predecessor. The differences between

[134] Gruenwald 1973: 476–77, Weinstock 1981: 37–38.

the two are too great – both in the extent of the material and the nature of their particular readings. However, the overlap in their shared material is so significant that the Saadyan version could have been constructed out of the Long Recension at an earlier stage in its development than we see in Ms A or Donnolo's commentary.[135]

I would certainly concur with all my predecessors that the order of the chapters and paragraphs in the Saadyan Recension is secondary to that which we find in the Long and the Short Recensions. My notes to the text will constantly attempt to provide the evidence for this conclusion. But this does not mean that the text of the individual paragraphs in the Saadyan Recension is inferior to that in the other two recensions. In fact, I have often been driven to the conclusion that the Saadyan Recension takes us closest to the "earliest recoverable text" of SY. This is the case in §§ 3, 12, 14, 18, 19, 22, 27–31 (i.e. omitting them), 39, 42/43a/43b (again omitting them), and 61. In the case of §§ 12, 14, 18, 19 and 61 it is Ms C (usually followed by E but not Z) which has the earliest text. This is not, after all, surprising since it is one of our two earliest manuscripts. But that puts paid to any simple line of development – Short Recension → Long Recension → Saadyan Recension. Ms C must in these paragraphs be taking us back to the time before the recensions arose.

Nor elsewhere is it the case that I always find the "earliest recoverable text" in the Short Recension. We have already seen that the Short Recension version of § 12 is probably the latest form of the text. In § 2 I find the earliest form of the text in most Long Recension manuscripts and one Short Recension manuscript, i.e. they omit it. In § 20 the earliest form is in Mss AB^2 and Donnolo. The Long and Saadyan Recensions omit § 50, probably correctly, against the two versions of it in the Short Recension manuscripts. Combined with the paragraphs cited above where the Saadyan Recension text is preferable to all others this is sufficient evidence to demonstrate that we cannot simply identify the Short Recension as the "earliest recoverable text". This can have been preserved in any of our textual witnesses, though, admittedly, it is most often found in the Short Recension but, then, very often supported by Dunash, Judah, and one of the other recensions.

In a number of paragraphs the best text is preserved in all the recensions and in these paragraphs we can have the most confidence that we are in touch with the "earliest recoverable text" of SY, namely, §§ 5, 7, 8, 15, 23, 25, 37a, 40, 45, 47, and 59. Everywhere else a judgement has to be made between the evidence of all our available witnesses and no "rule of thumb" can be applied.

What light does all this throw on the history of SY? Unfortunately, not a great deal. Since the text of SY emerges into the light of day early in the tenth century in all its complexity we would have to allow sufficient time for the complex processes of development traced in my notes to the text. See, for example, the notes

[135] An alternative way to phrase this would be to say that the Saadyan Recension was created out of a Short Recension text that had already received some of the expansions that would later come to characterize the Long Recension.

on §§ 41–44 and 48–49 where I feel the need to allow for six stages in the growth of these complexes. But how much time do we need to allocate for this? I would guess at least one hundred years but, in the absence of any ninth century textual witnesses, it is impossible to be sure. The possibility discussed above that Isaac Israeli (850 – 932?) wrote a commentary on SY puts its date back to at least the first half of the ninth century, possibly earlier if we have to allow it time to have taken on the aura of an ancient enough text to warrant such attention. However, at this point we cease to have any concrete evidence of the existence of SY[136] and start to have to rely on less firm criteria than hitherto. We pass over from textual to literary and historical criticism and the search for relevant parallels in content. That search must be left for another book.

[136] Ezra Fleischer, "On the Antiquity of Sefer Yezira: The Qilirian Testimony revisited", *Tarbiz* 71 (2002), 405–432, has removed the alleged sixth century citation of SY by Eleazar Kalir from contention as the earliest reference to SY. I am grateful to Professor Stefan Reif for drawing my attention to this article.

Appendix I

The Attestation of the Paragraphs in the Manuscripts
(× = paragraph is present in the manuscript)

	Long Recension						Saadyan Recension			Short Recension									
Mss:	A	B^1	B^2	G	D	H	C	Z	E	K	L	M	N	S	F	P	I	Q	R
§																			
1	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
2	×				×		×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×		×
3	×	×		×			×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
4	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
5	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
6	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
7	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
9	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
10	×		×		×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
11	×	×	×	×		×													
12	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
13	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
14	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
15	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
16	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
17	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
18	×		×		×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
19	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
20	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
21	×	×	×		×	×				×	×			×	×	×	×		×
22	×	×	×		×	×				×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×

	Long Recension						Saadyan Recension			Short Recension									
Mss:	A	B^1	B^2	G	D	H	C	Z	E	K	L	M	N	S	F	P	I	Q	R
23	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
24	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
25	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
26	×		×	×	×		×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
27	×	×	×	×	×					×	×	×	×	×	×		×	×	×
28	×	×	×	×	×					×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
29	×	×	×		×	×				×	×	×	×	×	×		×	×	×
30	×	×	×	×	×	×				×	×			×	×	×	×	×	×
31	×	×	×	×	×	×				×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
32	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
33	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
34	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
35	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×										
36	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×										
37	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
38	×	×	×	×	×		×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
39	×	×	×	×	×		×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
40	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
41	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×										
42	×	×	×	×	×	×				×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
43a	×	×	×	×		×				×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
43b	×	×		×		×													
43c	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×										
44	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×										
45	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
46	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×										
47	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
48a	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×		×	×		×	×	×	×	×
48b	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
49	×	×	×	×	×	×				×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
50										×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
52	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×										

	Long Recension						Saadyan Recension			Short Recension									
Mss:	A	B^1	B^2	G	D	H	C	Z	E	K	L	M	N	S	F	P	I	Q	R
53=43c		×	×	×		×	×	×											
54	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×										
55	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×										
56		×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
57	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×										
58	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
59	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
60a	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×										
60b	×	×	×	×	×	×				×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
61	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
62	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×									×
63	×	×	×	×	×	×			×	×						×?			×
64	×	×	×	×	×	×				×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×

Note: § 51 in Gruenwald's reckoning is actually the Short Recension version of the first sentence of § 56 (=§ 56a). See the notes to that paragraph. Accordingly, I have left it out of this table and the table of the order of the paragraphs.

Appendix II

The Order of the Paragraphs in the Manuscripts

(Chapter divisions marked in capital Roman numerals)

Long Recension						Saadyan Recension			Short Recension									
A	B^1	B^2	G	D	H	C	Z	E	K	L	M	N	S	F	P	I	Q	R
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	4	4	3	2	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2
3	5	5	4	4	5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3
4	6	6	5	5	6	7	7	7	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	7	4
5	7	7	6	6	7	9	9	9	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	8	7
6	8	8	7	7	8	23	23	23	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	6	8
7	9	9	8	8	9	37a	37a	37a	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	5	5
8	3	3	9	10	3	45	45	45	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	10	6
9	11	10	11	12	10	58a	56a	58a	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	12	10
10	12	11	12	9	11	59a	58a	59a	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	13	12
11	13	12	13	13	12	4	59a	II	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	14	13
12	14	13	14	14	13	8	II	4	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	15	14
13	15	14	15	15	14	9	4	8	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	16	15
14	16	15	16	16	15	24a	8	9	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	II	16
15	II	16	II	9	16	38	9	24a	II	II	II	II	II	II	II	II	9	II
16	9	II	9	17	II	46	24a	38	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	23	9
II	17	9	17	18	9	47	37b	46	19a	26	23	23	17	23	17	23	26	17
9	19	17	19	19	17	18	38	47	17	17	17	17	18	26	18	17	17	19a
17	20	18	20	20	18	58b	46	18	18	18	18	18	19	19a	19	18	18	17
18	21	19	23	21	19	5	47	58b	19b	19	19	19	20	17	20	19	19	18
19	22	20	24	22	20	6	56a	III	20	20	20	20	21	18	21	20	20	19b
20	III	21	25	23	21	9	18	5	21	21	22	22	22	19b	22	21	22	20

Long Recension						Saadyan Recension			Short Recension									
A	B^1	B^2	G	D	H	C	Z	E	K	L	M	N	S	F	P	I	Q	R
21	23	22	26	24	22	25	58b	6	22	22	III	III	III	20	III	22	III	21
22	24	III	27	25	III	26	III	9	III	III	23	23	23	22	23	III	23	22
III	25	23	28	26	23	24b	5	25	23	23	24	24	24	21	24	23	24	III
23	27	24	30	27	24	37b	6	26	24	24	27	27	26	22	28	24	27	23
24	28	25	31	28	25	48a	9	24b	26	27	28	28	27	III	30	26	28	24
25	29	26	32	29	29	40	25	37b	27	28	29	29	28	23	31	27	29	26
26	30	27	33	30	30	56	26	48a	28	29	31	31	31	24	32	28	30	27
27	31	28	34	31	31	57	24b	40	29	30	32	32	29	26	33	29	31	28
28	32	29	35	32	32	10	37b	56	30	31	33	33	30	27	34	30	32	29
29	33	30	36	33	33	12	48a	57	31	32	34	34	32	28	IV	31	33	30
30	34	31	III	34	34	9	40	IV	32	33	IV	IV	34	29	37	32	34	31
31	35	32	37	35	35	17	56	10	34	34	37	37	33	30	38	34	IV	32
32	36	33	38	36	36	19	57	12	33	IV	38	38	IV	31	39	33	37	34
33	IV	34	39	37	IV	20	IV	9	IV	37	39	39	37	32	42	IV	38	33
34	37	35	40	38	37	12	10	17	37	38	42	42	38	33	40	37	39	IV
35	38	36	41	39	40	13	12	19	38	39	40	40	39	34	43a	38	42	37
36	39	IV	42	40	41	14	9	20	39	42	43a	43a	40	IV	42	39	40	38
IV	40	37	43a	41	42	15	17	12	40	40	42	42	43a	37	V	42	43a	39
37	41	38	43b	42	43a	16	19	13	43a	43a	V	V	42	38	45	40	42	42
38	42	39	43c	43c	43b	32	20	14	42	42	45	45	V	39	47	43a	V	40
39	43a	43a	44	44	43c	33	13	15	V	V	47	47	45	42	49	42	45	43a
40	43b	40	IV	45	44	34	14	16	45	45	49	49	47	40	48a	V	47	42
41	43c	41	45	46	V	35	15	V	47	47	48a	48a	49	43a	50	45	49	V
42	44	42	46	47	45	39	16	32	49	49	50	50	50	42	56	47	48a	45
43a	V	43c	47	48	46	41	V	33	48a	50	56	56	56	V	VI	49	50	47
43b	45	44	48	49	47	43c	32	34	50	56	VI	VI	58	45	58	48a	56	49
43c	46	45	49	52	48	48	33	35	56	58	58	58	59a	47	59a	50	VI	48a
44	47	46	52	53	49	52	34	39	58	59a	59a	59a	25	49	25	56	58	50
45	48	47	53	54	52	53	35	41	59a	25	25	25	59b	48a	26	VI	59a	56
46	49	48	54	55	54	62	39	43c	25	59b	26	26	60b	50	59b	58	25	58
47	52	49	55	56	55	36	41	VI	59b	60b	59b	59b	48b	56	60b	59a	26	59a
48	54	52	56	57	56	44	43c	48	60b	48b	60b	60b	61	VI	48b	25	59b	25
49	55	53	57	58	57	54	VI	52	48b	61	48b	48b	64	58	(63)	26	60b	59b

Long Recension						Saadyan Recension			Short Recension									
A	B^1	B^2	G	D	H	C	Z	E	K	L	M	N	S	F	P	I	Q	R
52	56	54	58	59	58	55	48	53	61	64	61	61		59a	61	59b	48b	60b
54	57	55	59	60a	59	59b	52	**VII**	62		64	64		25	64	60b	61	48b
55	58	56	60a	55	60a	60a	53	62	63					26		48b	64	61
57	59	57	55	60b	55	55	**VII**	**VIII**	64					59b		61		62
58	60a	58	60b	61	60b	61	62	36						60b		64		63
59	55	59	61	62	61		**VIII**	44						48b				64
60	60b	60a	62	63	62		36	54						61				
61	61	55	63	64	63		44	63						64				
62	62	60b	64		64		54	55										
63	63	61					55	59b										
64	64	62					59b	60a										
		63					60a	55										
		64					55	61										
							61											

Appendix III

The Earliest Recoverable Text of Sefer Yeṣira

(1) שלשים ושתים נתיבות פלאות חכמה חקק יה יהוה צבאות בשלש ספרים בספר וספר וספ(ו)ר.

(3) עשר ספירות בלימה מספר עשר אצבעות חמש כנגד חמש וברית יחיד מכוונת באמצע במילה ולשון ופה.

(4) עשר ספירות בלימה עשר ולא תשע, עשר ולא אחת עשרה הבן בחכמה וחכם בבינה בחון בהם וחקור מהם והעמד דבר על בריו והשב יוצר על מכונו.

(5) עשר ספירות בלימה בלום פיך מלדבר בלום לבך מלהרהר ואם רץ ליבך שוב למקום שכך נאמר רצוא ושוב ועל דבר זה נכרתה ברית.

(6) עשר ספירות בלימה נעוץ סופן בתחילתן ותחילתן בסופן כשלהבת בגחלת שהיוצר אחד ואין לו שיני ולפני אחד מה אתה סופר.

(7) עשר ספירות בלימה ומידתן עשר שאין להן סוף עומק ראשית ועומק אחרית עומק טוב ועומק רע עומק רום ועומק תחת עומק מזרח ועומק מערב עומק צפון ועומק דרום ואדון יחיד אל מלך נאמן מושל בכולן ממעון קדשו ועד עדי עד

(8) עשר ספירות בלימה צפיתן כמראה הבזק ותכליתם אין להן קץ ודברו בהן כרצוא ושוב ולמאמרו כסופה ירדופו ולפני כסאו הם משתחוים

(10) עשר ספירות בלימה אחת רוח אלהים חיים זו היא רוח הקודש

(12) שתים רוח מרוח חקק וחצב בה ארבע רוחות השמים

(13) שלש מים מרוח חקק וחצב בהם תוהו ובוהו רפש וטיט חקקן כמין ערוגה הציבן כמין חומה סיככן כמין מעזיבה

(14) ארבע אש ממים חקק וחצב בה כסא כבוד וכל צבא מרום שכך כתוב עשה מלאכיו רוחות

(15) חמש חתם רום פנה למעלה וחתמו ביהו שש חתם תחת פנה למטה וחתמו ביוה שבע חתם מזרח פנה לפניו וחתמו בהוי שמנה חתם מערב פנה לאחריו וחתמו בהיו תשע חתם דרום פנה לימינו וחתמו בויה. עשר חתם צפון פנה לשמאלו וחתמו בוהי

(16) אילו עשר ספירות בלימה רוח אלהים חיים ורוח מים אש. מעלה מטה מזרח מערב צפון ודרום

(9) עשרים ושתים אותיות יסוד שלש אמות שבע כפולות ושתים עשרה פשוטות

(17) [עשרים ושתים אותיות חקוקות בקול חצובות ברוח קבועות בפה בחמש מקומות אח הע בו מף גי כק דט לנת זס שרץ]

(18) עשרים ושתים אותיות קבועות בגלגל חזר גלגל פנים ואחור סימן לדבר אין בטובה למעלה מעונג ואם ברעה למטה בנגע

(19) עשרים ושתים אותיות חקקן חצבן צרפן שקלן והימירן [כיצד שקלן והמירן אלף עם כלם, וכלן עם אלף בית עם כלן וכלן עם בית וכלן חוזרות חלילה נמצאו יוצאות במאתים ושלשים ואחד שערים נמצא כל היצור וכל הדבור יוצא בשם אחד]

(20) יצר מתוהו ממש ועשאו באש וישנו וחצב עמודים גדולים מאויר שאינו נתפש.

(23) שלוש אימות אמש יסודן כף זכות וכף חובה ולשון חק מכריע בינתיים.

(24) שלוש אמות אמש סוד גדול מכוסה ומופלא וחתום בשש טבעות וממנו יוצאין אש מים ורוח ומחותל בזכר ונקבה.

(25) שלש(ה) [אמות] אש למעלה מים למטה ורוח [חק מכריע] בנתיים.

(26) שלש אמות אמש מם דוממת שין שורקת אלף רוח חק מכריע בנתים.

(32) [המליך את אלף ברוח וקשר לו כתר וחתם בו אויר בעולם רויה בשנה וגויה בנפש.

(33) המליך את מם במים וקשר לו כתר וחתם בו ארץ בעולם וקור בשנה ובטן בנפש.

(34) המליך את שין באש וקשר לו כתר וחתם בו שמים בעולם וחום בשנה וראש בנפש.]

(37a) שבע כפולות בגד כפרת מתנהגות בשתי לשונות חיים ושלום וחכמה ועושר חן זרע ממשלה ומתנהגות בשתי לשונות בי בי גימל גימל דלת דלת כף כף פי פי ריש ריש תיו תיו רק וקשה גיבור וחלש

(37b) [שבע כפולות בגד כפרת משתמשות בשני לשונות בֵּי בֵי גימל גַּמַל דָּלֶת דֶּלֶת כַּף כַּף פֵּי פֵּי רֵישׁ רֵישׁ תָּיו תָּיו רך וקשה תבנית גבור וחלש כפולות שהן תמורות תמורת חיים מות תמורת שלום רע תמורת חכמה אולת תמורת עושר עוני תמורת זרע שממה תמורת חן כיאור תמורת ממשלה עבדות]

(38) שבע כפולות בגד כפרת שש קצוות והיכל קדוש מוכן באמצע [והוא נושא את כולם]

(39) שבע כפולות בגד כפרת חקקן חצבן צרפן וצר בהן כוכבים ימים ושערים

(40) כאיזה צד צרפן שתי אבנים בונות שני בתים שלוש בונות ששה בתים ארבע בונות עשרים וארבע בתים חמש בונות מאה ועשרים בתים שש בונות שבע מאות ועשרים בתים שבע בונות חמשת אלפים וארבעים בתים מיכאן ואילך צא וחשוב מה שאין הפה יכולה לדבר ומה שאין האוזן יכולה לשמוע

(43c) [חיצה את העדים והעמידן אחה אחד לבדו עולם לבדו, שנה לבדה נפש לבדה].

(45) שתים עשרה פשוטות הוזחטילנסעצק יסודן ראיה שמיעה ריחה שיחה לעיטה תשמיש מעשה הילוך רוגז שחוק הרהור שינה.

(47) שנים עשר גבולי אלכסון גבול מזרחית צפונית גבול מזרחית דרומית גבול מזרחית רומית גבול מזרחית תחתית גבול צפונית תחתית גבול צפונית מערבית גבול צפונית רומית גבול מערבית תחתית גבול מערבית דרומית גבול מערבית רומית גבול דרומית תחתית גבול דרומית רומית

(48a)[137] שתים עשרה פשוטות חקקן צרפן חצבן שקלן והמירן וצר בהם מזלות וחדשים ומנהיגים

(56a) [אילו עשרים ושתים אותיות שבהן יסד יה׳ יוי׳ צבאות אלהים חיים אלהי ישראל רם ונשא שוכן עד וקדוש שמו]

(58a) שלשה אבות ותולדותיהן ושבעה כבשים וצבאותיהן ושנים עשר גבולי אכלוסין וראיה לדבר עדים נאמנים עולם שנה ונפש

(59) חק עשרה שלשה ושבעה ושנים עשר פקודין בתלי וגלגל ולב. תלי בעולם כמלך על כסאו גלגל בשנה כמלך במדינה לב בנפש כמלך במלחמה

(60b) גם כל חפץ זה לעומת זה עשה אלהים טוב לעומת רע רע מרע וטוב מטוב טוב מבחין את רע ורע מבחין את טוב טובה גנוזה לטובים

(48a)[138] עשאן כמין מריבה וערכן כמין מלחמה גם את זה לעמת זה עשה האלהים

(48b) שלשה אחד אחד לבדו עומד שבעה שלשה חלוקין על שלשה ואחד חוק מכריע בנתיים שנים עשר עומדין במלחמה שלשה אויבים ושלשה אוהבים שלשה מחיים ושלשה ממיתים וכולן אדוקין זה בזה

(61) כשהבין אברהם אבינו וצר וצרף וחקר וחשב ועלתה בידו ניגלה עליו יי

---

[137] Long and Saadyan Recension form.

[138] Short Recension form.

Appendix IV

The Long Recension Additions

This appendix contains an exact copy of Vatican (Cat. Assemani) 299(8), fols. 66a–71b, Ms A in my edition. I have underlined that material which is not present in my presumed "earliest recoverable text of SY" = Appendix III. The function of this appendix is purely illustrative to enable the reader to get some visual idea of the scope and nature of the additions made to the text of SY in the course of its growth and development. As the notes to the text show, it is not in fact a simple case of a series of additions being made to one core text. Things are far more complicated than that. Sometimes the entire text of a paragraph has been rewritten. So this appendix should always be considered along with these notes.

Punctuation is provided only where there is a corresponding mark in the manuscript.

(1) שלשים ושנים נתיבות פלאות חכמה חקק יה י"י צבאות אלהי ישראל אלהים חיים אל שדי רם ונישא שוכן עד וקדוש שמו ברא את עולמו בשלשה ספרים בספר וספר וספר.

(2) עשר ספירות בלימה ועשרים ושתים אותיות יסוד.

(3) עשר ספירות בלימה מספר עשר אצבעות חמש כנגד חמש וברית ייחוד מכוונת באמצע במילת לשון ופה ובמילת המעיה.

(4) עשר ספירות בלימה עשר ולא תשע עשר ולא אחת עשרה הבין בחכמה וחכום בבינה בחון בהם וחקור בהן דע וחשוב וצור והעמד דבר על בוריו והשב יוצר על מכונו ומידתן עשר שאין להן סוף.

(5) עשר ספירות בלימה בלום ליבך מלהרהר בלום פיך מלדבר ואם רץ ליבך שוב למקום שיצאתה ממנו וזכור שכך נאמר והחיות רצוא ושוב ועל דבר זה נכרת ברית

(6) ומידתן עשר שאין להן סוף נעוץ סופן בתחילתן ותחילתן בסופן כשלהבת קשורה בגחלת דע וחשוב וצור שאדון יחיד והיוצר אחד ואין לו שיני ולפני אחד מה אתה סופר.

(7) עשר ספירות בלימה ומידתן עשר שאין להן סוף עומק ראשית ועומק אחרית עומק טוב ועומק רע עומק רום ועומק תחת עומק מזרח ועומק מערב עומק צפון ועומק דרום ואדון יחיד אל מלך נאמן מושל בכולן ממעון קדשו ועד עדי עד.

(8) עשר ספירות בלימה צפייתן כמראה הבזק ותכליתן אין בהן קץ דברו בהן כרצוא ולמאמרו כסופה ירדופו ולפני כסאו הן משתחוים.

(9) עשר ספירות בלימה ועשרים ושתים אותיות יסוד שלש אימות ושבע כפולות ושתים עשרה פשוטות ורוח אחת מהן.

(10) עשר ספירות בלימה אחת רוח אלהים חיים. נכון כסאו מאז ברוך ומבורך שמו שלחי העולמים לעולם ועד קול ורוח ודיבור זו היא רוח הקודש.

(11) עשר ספירות בלימה אחת רוח אלהים חיים שתים רוח מרוח הקודש שלוש מים מרוח ארבע אש ממים ורום ותחת ומזרח ומערב וצפון ודרום.

(12) שתים רוח מרוח חקק וחצב בה ארבע רוחות השמים מזרח ומערב צפון ודרום ורוח בכל אחת מהן.

(13) שלוש מים מרוח חקק וחצב בה תוהו ובהו רפש וטיט עשאן כמין ערוגה הציבן כמין חומה וסיככן כמין מעזיבה ויצק שלג עליהן ונעשה עפר שנאמר כי לשלג יאמר הוי ארץ תוהו זה קו ירוק שמקיף את העולם בוהו אילו אבנים מפולמות המשוקעות בתהום ומביניהן המים יוצאין.

(14) ארבע אש ממים חקק וחצב בה כסא כבוד ואופנים ושרפים וחיות הקודש ומלאכי השרת ומשלשתן ייסד מעונו עושה מלאכיו רוחות משרתיו אש לוהט.

(15) חמש חתם רום בירר שלוש פשוטות וקבען בשמו הגדול יוד הי ויו וחתם בהן שש קצוות ופנה למעלה וחיתמו ביהו.שש חתם תחת ניפנה למטה וחיתמו ביוה. שבע חתם מזרח ניפנה לפניו וחיתמו בהיו. שמינית חתם מערב ניפנה לאחריו וחיתמו בהוי. תשיעית חתם דרום ניפנה לימינו וחיתמו בויה. עשר חתם צפון נפנה לשמאלו וחיתמו בוהי.

(16) אילו עשר ספירות בלימה: אחת רוח אלהים חיים. שתים רוח מרוח. שלוש מים מרוח. ארבע אש ממים ורום מעלה ותחת מזרח ומערב צפון ודרום. חסלת.

(17) עשרים ושתים אותיות יסוד שלוש אימות ושבע כפולות ושתים עשרה פשוטות חקוקות בקול חצובות ברוח קבועות בפה בחמשה מקומות. אח הע בומף גיכק דטלנת זסצרש קשורות בראש הלשון כשלהבת בגחלת אה חע משתמשות בסוף הלשון ובבית הבליעה בומף משתמשות בין שפתים ובראש הלשון. גיכק על שליש הלשון נכרתות. דטלנת בראש הלשון משתמשות עם הקול. זסצרש בין שיניים ובלשון ישן.

(18) עשרים ושתים אותיות יסוד קבועות בגלגל במאתים ועשרים ואחד שערים חוזר הגלגל פנים ואחור וזה סימן לדבר אם לטובה למעלה מנגע ואם לרעה למטה מנגע [נא׳ מענג A^{mg}]

(19) עשרים ושתים אותיות חקקן חצבן שקלן והמירן וצרפן וצר בהן נפש כל היצור ונפש כל העתיד לצור כאי צד שקלן והמירן אלף עם כולן וכולן עם אלף בית עם כולן וכולן עם בית גימל עם כולן וכולן עם גימל וכולן חוזרות חלילה נמצאו יוצאות במאתים ועשרים ואחד שערים נמצא כל היצור וכל הדיבור יוצא בשם אחד.

(20) יצר מתוהו ממש ועשאו באש וישנו וחצב עמודים גדולים מאויר שאינו נתפש זה סימן:

(21) אל בת גש דר הק וץ זף חע טס ין כם
אב גת דש הר וק זץ חף תע ים כן לס אג דת הש ור זק חץ טף יע כם לן בם
אד בג הת וש זר חק טץ יף כע לס מן אה בד ות זש חר טק יץ כף לע מס גן

או בה גד זת חש טר יק כץ לף מע נס אז בו גה חת טש יר כק לץ מף נע דס
אח בז גו דה טת יש כר לק מץ נף סע אט בח גז דו ית כש לר מק נץ סף הע
אי בט גה דז הו כת לש מר נק סץ עף אך בי גט דח הן לת מש נר סק עץ וף
אל בך גי דט הת וז מת נש סר עק פץ אם בל גך די הט וח נת סש ער פק זץ
אן בם גל דך הי וט זח סת עש פר צק אס בן גם דל הך וי זט עת פש צר חק
אע בס גן דם הל וך זי חט פת צש קר אף בע גס דן הם ול זך חי צת קש טר
אץ בף גע דס הן ום זל חך טי קת רש אק בץ גף דע הס ון זם חל טך רת יש
אר בק גץ דף הע וס זן חם טל יך שת.
אש בר גק דץ הף וע זס חן טם יל כת את בש גר דק הץ וף זע חס טן ים כל.

(22) צופה ומימיר עושה את כל היצור ואת כל דיבור שם אחד וסימן לדבר עשרים ושתים חפצים בגוף אחד.חסלת.

(23) שלוש אימות אמש יסודן כף זכות וכף חובה ולשון חק מכריע בינתיים.

(24) שלוש אימות אמש סוד גדול מכוסה ומופלא וחתום בשש טבעות וממנו יוצאין אש מים ורוח ומחותל בזכר ונקבה דע וחשב וצור שהאש נושא מים.

(25) שלוש אימות אמש תולדות השמים אש תולדות אויר רוח תולדות ארץ מים אש למעלה מים למטה ורוח חק מכריע בינתיים.

(26) שלוש אימות אמש מם רוממת, שין שורקת, אלף חק מכריע בינתיים.

(27) שלוש אימות אמש ומהן נולדו שלושה אבות שמהם נבראו הכל.

(28) שלוש אימות אמש בעולם רוח ומים ואש שמים נבראו תחילה מאש, וארץ נבראת ממים, ואויר נברא מרוח מכריע בינתיים.

(29) שלוש אימות אמש בשנה אש מים ורוח חום נברא מאש, קור נברא ממים, רוויה רוח מכריע בינתיים.

(30) שלוש אימות אמש בנפש ראש נברא מאש, ובטן ממים, וגויה רוח מכריע בינתיים.

(31) שלוש אימות אמש חקקן חצבן צרפן וחתם בהן שלוש אימות בעולם ושלוש אימות בשנה ושלוש אימות בנפש זכר ונקבה.

(32) המליך את אלף ברוח וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה בזה וצר בהן אויר בעולם ורווייה בשנה וגויה בנפש זכר ונקבה זכר באמש ונקבה באשם.

(33) המליך את מם במים וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה בזה וצר בו ארץ בעולם וקור בשנה ובטן בנפש. זכר ונקבה.

(34) המליך את שין באש וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו שמים בעולם וחום בשנה וראש בנפש זכר ונקבה.

(35) כאיזה צד צרפן אמש אשם מאש משא שמא שאם שמים אש אויר רוח ארץ מים ראשו שלאדם אש בטנו מים לבו רוח.

(36) שלוש אימות אמש נוצר עם אלף רוח אויר רוויה וגויה וחוק ולשון. נוצר עם מם ארץ קור ובטן וכף זכות. נוצר עם שין שמים וחום וראש וכף חובה זה אמש. חסלת.

(37a) שבע כפולות בגד כפרת יסודן חיים ושלום וחכמה ועושר זרע וחן וממשלה ומתנהגות בשתי לשונות שהם כפולות שלתמורות בית בית גימל גימל דל דל כף כף פה פה ריש ריש תיו תיו כנגד רך וקשה תבנית גיבור כנגד חלש

(37b) והן תמורות: תמורת חיים מוות, תמורת שלום רע [מלחמה A^{mg}], תמורת חכמה איולת, תמורת עושר עוני, תמורת זרע שממה, תמורת חן כיעור, תמורת ממשלה עבדות.

(38) שבע כפולות בגד כפרת שבע ולא שש שבע ולא שמונה מכוון שש צלעות לששה סדרים והיכל קדוש מוכן באמצע ברוך כבוד י"י ממקומו הוא מקומו של עולמו ואין עולמו מקומו והוא נושא את כולן.

(39) שבע כפולות בגד כפרת חקקן וחצבן צרפן שקלן והמירן וצר בהן כוכבים בעולם וימים בשנה ושערים בנפש שבעה שבעה.

(40) כאיזה צד צרפן שתי אבנים בונות שני בתים שלוש בונות ששה בתים, ארבע בונות עשרים וארבע בתים, חמש בונות מאה ועשרים בתים שש בונות שבע מאות ועשרים בתים, שבע בונות חמשת אלפים וארבעים בתים. מיכאן ואילך צא וחשוב מה שאין הפה יכולה לדבר ומה שאין העין יכולה לראות ומה שאין האוזן יכולה לשמוע.

(41) 1 המליך את בית וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו שבתי בעולם ושבת בשנה ופה בנפש.

2 המליך את גימל וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו צדק בעולם ואחד בשבת בשנה ועין ימין בנפש.

3 המליך את דל וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו מאדים בעולם ושיני בשבת בשנה ועין שמאול בנפש.

4 המליך את כף וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו חמה בעולם ושלישי בשבת בשנה ואף ימין בנפש.

5 המליך את פה וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו נוגה בעולם ורביעי בשבת בשנה ואף שמאול בנפש.

6 המליך את ריש וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו כוכב חמה בעולם וחמישי בשבת בשנה ואוזן ימין בנפש.

7 המליך את תיו וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו לבנה בעולם וששי בשבת בשנה ואוזן שמאל בנפש.

(42) ובהן נחקקו שבעה רקיעים ושבע ארצות ושבע שעות ושבעה ימים לפיכך חיבב שביעי לכל חפץ תחת השמים.

(43) ואילו הן שבעה כוכבים בעולם: חמה, נוגה, כוכב חמה, לבנה, שבתי, צדק, מאדים. ושבעה ימים שבעת ימי בראשית, ושבעה שערים בנפש שתי עינים ושתי אזנים ושתי נחיריים ופה. ושבעה רקיעים: וילון, רקיע, שחקים, זבול, מעון, מכון, ערבות. ושבע ארצות: אדמה ארקה, תבל, נשייה, צייה, חלה, ארץ.[חיצה את העדים והעמידן אחה אחד לבדו, עולם לבדו, שנה לבדה, נפש לבדה.]

(44) שבע כפולות בגד כפרת נוצר עם בית שבתי שבת ופה וחיים ומוות. נוצר עם גימל צדק ואחד בשבת ועין ימין ושלום ורע. נוצר עם דל מאדים ושיני בשבת ועין שמאל וחכמה ואיולת. נוצר עם כף חמה ושלישי בשבת ואף ימין ועושר ועוני. נוצר עם פה נוגה ורביעי בשבת ואף שמאל וזרע ושממה. נוצר עם ריש כוכב חמה וחמישי בשבת ואוזן ימין וחן וכיאור. נוצר עם תיו לבנה וערב שבת ואוזן שמאל וממשלה ועבדות זה בגד כפרת.

(45) שתים עשרה פשוטות הוזחטילקסעצק יסודן ראייה שמיעה הריחה ושהות ולעיטה ותשמיש מעשה והילוך רוגז ושחוק הירהור ושינה.

(46) שתים עשרה פשותות הוזחטילקסעצק שתים עשרה ולא אחת עשרה.

(47) שנים עשר גבולי אכלוסין מופצלין לששה סדרים מופסקין בין רוח לרוח גבול מזרחית דרומית גבול מזרחית רומית גבול מזרחית תחתית גבול צפונית תחתית גבול צפונית מערבית גבול צפונית רומית גבול מערבית תחתית גבול מערבית רומית גבול מערבית רומית גבול מערבית תחתית גבול דרומית תחתית גבול דרומית רומית ומרחיבין והולכין עד עדי עד והן הן זרועות עולם.

(48a) שתים עשרה פשוטות הוזחטילקסעצק חקקן צרפן חצבן שקלן והמירן וצר בהן מזלות וחדשים ומנהיגין שני עליזין ושני לועזין ושני נועזין ושני עליצין והן קורקבנין ושתי ידים ושתי רגלים עשאן כמן מריבה ערכן כמן מלחמה זה לעומת זה

(48b) שלשה אחד אחד לבדו עומד שבעה שלשה חלוקין על שלשה ואחד חוק מכריע בנתיים שנים עשר עומדין במלחמה שלשה אויבים ושלשה אוהבים שלשה מחיים ושלשה ממיתים ואל מלך נאמן מושל בכולן אחד על גבי שלשה ושלשה על גבי שבעה ושבעה על גבי שנים עשר וכולן אדוקין זה בזה וסימן לדבר עשרים ושנים חפצים בגוף אחד.

(49) שתים עשרה פשוטות הוזחטילקסעצק חקקן וחצבן צרפן שקלן והמירן וצר בהן שנים עשר מזלות בעולם ושנים עשר חדשים בשנה ושנים עשר מנהיגים בנפש.ואילו הן שנים עשר מזלות טלה, שור, תאומים, סרטן, אריה, בתולה, מאזנים, עקרב, קשת, גדי, דלי, דגים. ושנים עשר חדשים ניסן, אייר, סיון, תמוז, אב, אלול, תשרי, מרחשוון, כסליו, טבת, שבת, אדר. אילו הן שנים עשר מנהיגין בנפש: שתי ידים, שתי רגלים, שתי כליות, כבד, ומרה, טחול, המסס, קרקבן, וקיבה.

(52) 1 המליך הי וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו טלה בעולם וניסן בשנה וכבד בנפש.

2 המליך את ויו וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו שור בעולם ואייר בשנה ומרה בנפש.

3 המליך את זיין וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו תאומים בעולם וסיון בשנה וטחול בנפש.

4 המליך את חית וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה בזה וצר בו סרטן בעולם ותמוז בשנה והמסס בנפש.

5 המליך את טית וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה בזה וצר בו אריה בעולם ואב בשנה וכוליה של ימין.

6 המליך את יוד וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו בתולה בעולם ואלול בשנה וכוליה שלשמאל בנפש.

7 המליך את למד וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו מאזנים בעולם ותשרי בשנה וקרקבן בנפש.

8 המליך את נון וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו עקרב בעולם ומרחשוון בשנה וקיבה בנפש.

9 המליך את סמך וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו קשת בעולם וכסליו בשנה ויד ימין בנפש.
10 המליך את עין וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה בזה וצר בו גדי בעולם וטבת בשנה ויד שמאל בנפש.
11 המליך את צדי וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה בזה וצר בו דלי בעולם ושבט בשנה ורגל ימין בנפש.
12 המליך את קוף וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה בזה וצר בו דגים בעולם ואדר בשנה ורגל שמאול בנפש.
(54) שתים עשרה פשוטות הוזחטילזסעצק
1 נוצר עם הי טלה ניסן וכבד וראייה וסמיות.
2 נוצר עם ויו שור אייר ומרה ושמיעה וחרשות.
3 נוצר עם זיין תאומים סיון וטחול וריחה וסרחות.
4 נוצר עם חית סרטן תמוז והמסס.
5 נוצר עם טית אריה אב וכוליה של ימין לעיטה ורעבתנות.
6 נוצר עם יוד בתולה אלול וכוליה של שמאל ומעשה וגידמות.
7 נוצר עם למד מאזנים תשרי וקרקבן תשמיש וסריות.
8 נוצר עם נון עקרב מרחשוון וקיבה והילוך וחיגרות.
9 נוצר עם סמך קשת [71a_fol] וכסליו יד ימין ורוגז וניטול כבד.
10 נוצר עם עין גדי טבת ויד שמאל ושחוק וניטול טחול.
11 נוצר עם צדי דלי שבט רגל ימין והירהור וניטול הלב.
12 נוצר עם קוף דגים אדר ורגל שמאל וישיבה ומעות.
(55) זה הוזחטילזסעצק וכולן אדוקין בתלי וגלגל ולב.
(57) שנים עשר למטה ושבעה למעלה על גביהן ושלשה על גבי שבעה ומשלשתן ייסד מעונו וכולן תלויין באחד סימן לאחד, ואין לו שני מלך יחיד בעולמו שהוא אחד ושמו אחד.
(58) שלשה אבות ותולדותיהן ושבעה כבשים וצבאותיהן ושנים עשר גבולי אכלוסין וראיה לדבר עדים נאמנים עולם שנה ונפש עולם ספירתו בעשרה שנה ספירתה בעשרה נפש ספירתה בעשרה ועשרים ושנים חפצים יש בכל אחד. בעולם שלשה אש רוח ומים ושבעה כוכבים ושנים עשר מזלות. בשנה שלשה קור וחום ורוויה שבעת ימי בראשית ושנים עשר חדשים בנפש שלשה ראש ובטן וגיויה שבעה שערים ושנים עשר מנהיגין.
(59) חק עשרה שלשה ושבעה ושנים עשר פקודין בתלי וגלגל ולב. תלי בעולם כמלך על כסאו, גלגל בשנה כמלך במדינה, לב בנפש כמלך במלחמה.
(60) כללו של דבר מקצת אילו נצטרפין עם אילו ואילו עם אילו. אילו תמורות אילו ואילו תמורות אילו. אילו כנגד אילו, ואילו כנגד אילו. ואם אין אילו אין אילו. גם כל חפץ זה לעומת זה ברא אלהים טוב לעומת רע רע מרע וטוב מטוב טוב מבחין את רע ורע מבחין את טוב טובה גנוזה לטובים.
(61) וכיון שבא אברהם אבינו והיביט וראה וחקר והבין וחקק וצרף וחצב וחשב ועלתה בידו נגלה עליו אדון הכל והושיבו בחיקו ונשקו על ראשו קראו אוהבו ושמו בנו וכרת לו ברית ולזרעו לעולם והאמין בי׳׳י ויחשבה לו צדקה וקרא עליו כבוד י׳׳י דכתיב בטרם אצרך בבטן ידעתיך וגומר וכרת

לו ברית בתוך עשר אצבעות רגליו והוא בשר מילה כרת לו ברית בתוך עשר אצבעות ידיו והוא לשון קשר עשרים ושתים אותיות בלשונו והקדוש גילה לו סוד משכן כמים דלקן כאש ריעשן כרוח ביערן כשבעה ניהגם בשנים עשר מזלות.

1(62) אויר רוויה וגיויה, ארץ קור ובטן, שמים חום וראש זה אמש.

2 שבתי שבת ופה, צדק אחד בשבת ועין ימין, מאדים שיני בשבת ועין שמאל, חמה שלישי בשבת ואף ימין, נוגה רביעי בשבת ואף שמאל, כוכב חמה חמישי בשבת ואוזן ימין, לבנה שישי בשבת ואוזן שמאל. זה בגד כפרת.

3 טלה ניסן כבד, שור אייר מרה, תאומין סיון טחול, סרטן תמוז המסס, אריה אב כוליה ימנית, בתולה אלול כוליה שמאלית, מאזנים תשרי קרקבן, עקרב מרחשוון קיבה, קשת כסליו יד ימין, גדי טבט יד שמאל, דלי שבת רגל ימין, דגים אדר רגל שמאל. זה הוזחטילזסעצק.

1(63) שלשה אויבים אילו הן לשון וכבד ומרה.

2 שלשה אוהבים עינים ואזנים ולב.

3 שלשה מחיים שני חוטמין וכבד של שמאל.

4 שלשה ממיתים שני נקבים התחתונים והפה.

5 שלשה שהן ברשותו ידים ורגלים והפה.

6 שלשה שאין ברשותו עיניו ואוזניו וחותמיו.

7 שלשה שמיעות לאוזן והן רעות קללה וגידוף ושמועה רעה.

8 שלשה שמיעות לאוזן טובות ברכה וקילוס ושמועה טובה.

9 שלשה ראייות רעות עין נאפה ועין רעה ועין מגנבת.

10 שלשה ראייות טובות בושה ועין טובה ועין נאמנת.

11 שלשה ללשון רעות הדובר בפני ריעו רע והמלשין והמדבר אחד בפה ואחד בל.

12 שלוש ללשון טובות שתיקה ושמירת לשון ומדבר אמת.

(64) **הדין ספר אותיות דאברהם אבינו דמתקרי הלכות יצירה. כל דצפי ביה לית שיעור לחוכמתיה.**

Edition and Commentary

Sefer Yeṣira § 1

C

[בשלשים ושתים] נ[תיבות]
פלא[ות חכמה חקק יה יוי]
צבאות אלהי ישראל אלהים
חיים אל שדי קדוש ונורא
שמו שוכן עד .ברא את עולמו
בשלשה ספרים בספר וספר
וסיפור

By means of thirty-two wondrous paths of wisdom Yah, the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, the Living God, God Almighty, holy and terrible is his name, dwelling for ever, carved out. He created his universe with three types of things (whose names derive from the same root letters – s-p-r): with writing (*seper*) and numbers (*sᵉpar*) and speech (*sippur*).

A

שלשים ושנים נתיבות
פלאות חכמה חקק יה ייי
צבאות אלהי ישראל אלהים
חיים אל שדי רם ונישא
שוכן עד וקדוש שמו ברא
את עולמו בשלשה ספרים
בספר וספר וספר.

Yah, the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, the Living God, God Almighty, *high and exalted, dwelling for ever, and holy is his name* (Isa 57:15), carved out thirty-two wondrous paths of wisdom. He created his universe with three groups of letters (*separim*): with *seper* and *seper* and *seper.*

K

בשלשים ושתים נתיבות
פלאות חכמה חקק יה יהוה
צבאות אלהי ישראל אלהים
חיים אל שדי רם ונישא שוכן
עד וקדוש שמו ברא את
עולמו בשלשה ספרים[1] : בספר
וספר וספר.

By means of thirty-two wondrous paths of wisdom Yah, the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, the Living God, God Almighty, *high and exalted, dwelling for ever, and holy is his name* (Isa 57:15), carved out. He created his universe with three groups of letters (*separim*): with *seper* and *seper* and *seper.*[1]

[1] דברים K^{mg}

Z

בשלשים ושתים נתיבות
פְּלָאות חכמה חקק יה יוי
צבאות אלהי ישראל אלהים
חיים אל שדי רם ונשא שוכן
עד וקדוש שמו ברא את
עולמו בשלשה ספרים בְּסֶפֶר
וּסְפַר וְסִיפור.

D

בשלשים ושתים נתיבות
פלאות חכמה חקק יה
יהוה צבאות אלהים חיים
אלהי ישראל אל שדי רם
ונישא שוכן עד וקדוש שמו
בשלשה ספרים סֵפֶר סָפַר
וסְפור.

P

בשלשים ושתים נתיבות
פלאות חכמה חקק יה יהוה
צבאות שמו בג׳ ספרים ספר
וספר וספור.

[1] I have transliterated the Hebrew letter *Pē* here consistently with p in order to show as clearly as possible the play on words going on in the Hebrew text. Elsewhere I will use "f" to reflect the variant pronunciation of this letter when it is preceded by a vowel, e.g. in *sefirot*.

Q

בשלשים ושתים נתיבות
פליאות חכמה חקק יי צבאות
בשלש ספרים בספר וספר
וסיפור.

LMNSFIR collated to K:
בשלשים] בשלשים ושלשים ו. פלאות] פליאות MNFIR. אלהי ישראל] om LMN. אלהים וקדוש...חיים] om L. חיים] add MN. אל שדי ומלך עולם שמו ...] om MN. וספר 2°] וספור LS, וספור MNFIR.

B^1B^2GH collated to A:
ושתים] ושנים B^1B^2GH. פליאות] פליאות G. וספר 1°] ספר B^2. וספר 2°] וסיפור B^1B^2GH.

E collated to Z:
פליאות] פליאות E.

Notes on the text of § 1

The textual chaos of the manuscript tradition of SY is immediately apparent in § 1. Ms Q has thirteen words for this paragraph, P fifteen, L eighteen, D twenty-six, while the rest have twenty-eight or twenty-nine words. That the text has suffered considerable disruption is also clear from its syntactical problems. In most forms of the text the verb חקק is left without an object. Has the longer text evolved out of the shorter, or has the shorter text arisen from an attempt to resolve the syntactical problems of the longer form of the text? If it was the latter, then the attempt was not very successful. Even in the short form of the text (as in Mss P and Q) חקק is left without an object. In fact, the longest form of the text (in Mss AB^1B^2GH) is the easiest to construe; see my translation above. If we compare the different forms of the text we see that there are two main differences between the long and the short forms: the list of divine names can vary in length from two up to fifteen words, and in Mss DPQ the phrase ברא את עולמו is omitted. There are a few other minor variants.

The evidence from the early commentators generally supports the shorter forms of the text. Dunash ben Tamin, in the Oxford Bodleian Ms 2250 edited by Grossberg (1902: 18) has the exact same text as Ms P, but the Hebrew translation of his commentary by Moses ben Joseph of Lucerne (Vajda-Fenton 2002: 215) has וכו' instead of שמו, indicating that the list of divine names should be inserted. However, Georges Vajda's critical reconstruction of Dunash's text (2002: 41) places all these extra names in square brackets while Dunash's paraphrase of the text in his commentary presupposes the presence of only one name. And only this name (יהוה צבאות) is explained – אלוה כל המחנות. Neither Hebrew version of his commentary has ברא את עולמו and Dunash feels obliged to explain why the author has not used the verb ברא.[2] Shabbetai Donnolo has a very long form of the text

[2] Vajda-Fenton 2002: text p. 217, trans. p. 50, Grossberg 1902: 23.

(thirty-one words) and even provides the required object (את עולמו) after חקק (Castelli 1880: 34). Otherwise his text agrees fairly closely with that of Ms K, except for reading וספור as the last word.[3] Judah ben Barzillai cites a text which is generally closest to that of Ms D, except for reading שלשים at the beginning and בספר וספר וסיפור at the end (Halberstam 1885: 105, 138). He is aware of the readings בשלשים and ברא את עולמו but insists on the correctness of his reading. He says that the longer readings could be regarded as interpretative glosses (ויש לומר שאלו התיבות הנוספות בשאר הנוסחות כמו פירושין נכתבו). He recognises (p. 116) that the number of divine names cited in § 1 varies in the Mss – "there are versions here which mention fewer of these names and there are versions which mention more of them" (Halberstam 1885: 116). He says that the most accurate version has ten names parallel to the ten *ma'amarot* in Genesis 1 and the ten *sefirot*. Saadya says that these ten names refer to the ten Aristotelian categories and these in turn correlate with the Ten Commandments.[4] Presumably, this gives us a clue as to why these names were drawn into the text of SY from biblical texts like Isa 26:4, 57:16 and from *b. Ḥag.* 12b, 13a.[5]

If we look first at the problem of the number of divine names in the paragraph, we see that Judah is quite right. Their number does vary in the Mss, from one in LPQ and Dunash, four in Mss MN, up to nine or ten in most Mss. None of the shorter forms can be explained as scribal errors unless we presuppose that a manuscript ancestral to LPQ and Dunash had יהוה צבאות שמו followed by the list of divine names concluding with וקדוש שמו and that a subsequent copyist dropped the list by homoioteleuton. However, none of the extant Mss has such a reading, so scribal error as an explanation for this variant remains possible but purely hypothetical. It could not explain the name list in Mss MN. It is more convincing to see their reading as evidence of the list creeping up in size from one name on its way to the full ten required by the kind of exegesis we find in Saadya and Judah ben Barzillai. Take, for example the name אלהי ישראל, significantly omitted by Mss MN as well as LPQ and Dunash. The name ישראל occurs in SY only here and in § 56a as part of this divine name. But, at least on the surface,[6] SY shows no interest at all in the people of Israel or the political dimension of Judaism. This list of names recurs in § 56a but, as we shall see, there are serious text-critical problems with that paragraph – the bulk of it is missing in the Short Recension and our earliest manuscript (A) does not have it at all. I am inclined, therefore, to agree with Weinstock (1972:

[3] One of the Mss of the *Ḥakhemoni* cited by Castelli in his footnote 8 to this page shows how scribal errors could shorten the list of divine names: the Turin Ms omits אלהים חיים אל by homoioteleuton.

[4] Kafach 1972: 46–48, Lambert 1891: 20–22.

[5] For the importation of biblical and rabbinic material into the text of SY see Hayman 1984 and 1987.

[6] See Hayman 1986 for an attempt to show that the problem of the exile was actually central to the concerns of the author of SY.

32) that the earliest recoverable form of SY had only one divine name in § 1: יהוה צבאות or יה יהוה צבאות.[7]

And now for the problem of ברא את עולמו, omitted by DPQ, Dunash and Judah. Dunash's embarrassment at its absence is significant. To assess the likelihood of this phrase belonging to the earliest recoverable form of the text we need to briefly survey the relative textual attestation of the different words used in SY for God's creative activity. The word חקק (carved out) used in § 1, along with its companion verb חצב (hewed out) used in § 20, is absolutely characteristic of the vocabulary of SY in all recensions and texts.[8] Likewise the verbs צור and יצר and the noun יוצר belong to the original vocabulary of the text,[9] though they are not as firmly anchored in it as חקק and חצב. They clearly betray the artistic analogy behind the author's concept of creation. His choice of the words חקק and חצב cannot help but have evoked the idea of sculpture, of working on pre-existent materials. The verb ברא, on the other hand, has no such associations. But ברא is very loosely anchored in the text of SY. Apart from § 1 the Qal form of the verb is used elsewhere only in § 60 and there the quotation from Qohelet 7:14 in which it occurs is absent in the Saadyan recension, while about half the other manuscripts agree with Qoh 7:14 in reading עשה instead of ברא. In §§ 27–30 the Niphal of ברא is used, but these paragraphs are missing in the Saadyan recension and represent a reformulation of §§ 32–34 where the verbs חתם or צר are used. In no paragraph in SY is the verb ברא attested in all recensions and manuscripts. Its presence in § 1 could, then, be the result of that effort to correct the doctrine of creation in SY which we will see has so clearly muddled up the text of § 20.[10] Both Weinstock (1972: 34, n.17) and Gruenwald (1973: 482) are right, then, in agreeing with Judah ben Barzillai that ברא את עולמו is a later addition. Liebes takes the exact opposite line, seeing חקק as subordinate to ברא as the main verb in the paragraph, but he does not take the text-critical data into account (2000: 13–34). The problematic attestation of the verb ברא in SY § 1 and elsewhere in the text weakens Liebes' case for an analogical link between Gen 1:1 and SY § 1 (2000: 96).

And now for some of the minor textual variants in § 1:

The reading בשלשים for שלשים is regarded by Weinstock (1972: 32, n.2) and Gruenwald (1973: 481) as an attempt to correct the syntactical problems created when the phrase ברא את עולמו was inserted into the text. If so, it did not succeed in this task as my translations of Mss K and Z show. It is easier to construe the text without it; see my translation of Ms A, and also see Liebes 2000: 33 for the different interpretative implications of the two readings.

---

[7] This seems also to be the implication of Gruenwald's comments (1973: 482).

[8] See §§ 1, 12, 13, 14, (17), 19, 20, (31), (39), (42), (48), (49), (56), (61). Brackets round a paragraph number indicate that the words do not appear in all the textual witnesses to that paragraph.

[9] See §§ (4), (6), 19, 20, (22), (24), (31), (32), (33), (34), (36), 39, (41), (44), 48–49, (52), (54).

[10] See Hayman 1993 for a more detailed treatment of the concept of creation in SY.

שתים/שנים. The overwhelming weight of evidence favours the feminine שתים; hence נתיבות is the plural of נתיבה, *contra* Liebes 2000: 33.

פלאות. MNFIQR in the Short Recension, Ms G in the Long, and Ms E in the Saadyan Recension read פליאות, a reading which came through into the printed editions. Gruenwald (1973: 482) states that this reading is "certainly corrupt" and the weight of the manuscript evidence clearly favours such a judgement. Cf. Ps 119:129 and Dan 12:6.

חכמה. Weinstock (1972: 33, n.5) relegates this to the status of a gloss on the evidence of Judah ben Barzillai. He wonders also if פלאות before it should be similarly regarded. The overwhelming textual evidence is against such conjectures.

שמו in LP and Dunash. Weinstock (1972: 33, n.7) suggests that this provides an object for the verb חקק, i.e. "by thirty-two paths the Lord carved out his name in three ספרים". But it is more likely that שמו was dragged in after צבאות under the influence of Am 4:13.

The reading דברים for ספרים in the margin of Ms K was known to Judah ben Barzillai (Halberstam 1885: 138) who, no doubt correctly, regards it as an interpretative substitution for the obscure word ספרים here. It may go back ultimately to Saadya's Arabic translation of SY § 1 where he renders ספרים as אשיא (things) = דברים (Kafach: 35, Lambert: 13).

We have two divergent readings for the last three words of the paragraph:

בספר וספר וספר	בספר (ו)ספר וס(י)פור
A, KLMNSFIR	B^1B^2DGH, CZE, Judah ben B., Dunash, Donnolo

Weinstock regards the reading of Dunash as found in Oxford 2250, i.e. ספר ספר ספר (Grossberg 1902:18) as the original one. However, Moses ben Joseph's Hebrew version of this commentary has בספר וספר וסיפור and Vajda's reconstruction of the commentary based on all the extant sources has "dans l'écriture, le nombre et la parole."[11] This is the reading which is presupposed in the comments Dunash makes on these words. There is, then, no clear textual support for Weinstock's supposed original reading. However, Isaac of Acre says that this is the correct reading.[12]

The weight of the textual evidence for the two readings בספר וספר וספר and בספר (ו)ספר וס(י)פור is finely balanced and, to some extent, the choice between them comes down to what they may be supposed to mean and which makes best sense in the overall context of SY. Is the reference to the three modes of reality which can be expressed by words based on the root ספר, i.e. סֵפֶר[13] (writing – see Dan 1:4), סְפָר (number – II Chron 2:16), and סִיפּוּר (speech – Dunash cites Esther 5:11 to refer us to the Piel of ספר)? Or does it refer to the division of the alphabet into the three moth-

[11] Vajda-Fenton 2002, text p. 215, trans. p. 41.

[12] Cited by both Gruenwald 1973: 483 and Weinstock 1972: 34, n. 19

[13] The vocalization is that of Ms Z.

ers, seven doubles and twelve simple letters (§ 2 etc.), or the three spheres of God's creativity – the universe (עולם), time (גלגל), and humanity (נפש)? Any of these could be supported by the subsequent text of the work. Textual criticism here shades off into commentary. It is, however, easier to explain how בספר (ו)ספר וס(י)פור arose as an interpretation of בספר וספר וספר than the other way round. But may this not be a correct interpretation of the original author's intention?

In conclusion, the earliest recoverable form of SY § 1 would seem to be:

שלשים ושתים נתיבות פלאות חכמה חקק יה יהוה צבאות בשלש ספרים בספר וספר וסף(ו)ר

"Yah, the Lord of hosts, carved out thirty-two wondrous paths of wisdom by means of three types of things: by writing, by numbers and by speech."

This is very close to what Weinstock (1972: 58) restores as the "original" text of SY. Ithamar Gruenwald's argument that SY § 1 is "a late, and artificial addition to the book" (1973: 480) designed to weld together the two disparate parts of SY, i.e. §§ 1–16 and §§ 17–64, can be left aside for the moment. All the textual witnesses we have attest one or other form of this paragraph; we have no evidence that SY ever existed without it.

Sefer Yeṣira § 2

K

עשר ספירות בלימה ועשרים ושתים אותיות יסוד שלש אמות כפולות ושתים עשרה פשוטות.

The ten *sefirot* are the basis and the twenty-two letters are the foundation: three primary letters, [seven] double (letters), and twelve simple (letters).

A

עשר ספירות בלימה ועשרים ושתים אותיות יסוד.

The ten *sefirot* are the basis and the twenty-two letters are the foundation.

C

עשר ספירות עשר[ים] ושתים אותיות שלש אומות שבע כפולות [ושתים] עש[רה] פשוטות

Ten *sefirot*, twenty-two letters, three primary letters,[14] seven double (letters), and twelve simple (letters).

D

עשר ספירות בלי מה עשרים ושתים אותיות יסוד שלוש אמות שבע כפולות ושתים עשרה פשוטות.

Z

עשר ספירות בלימה עשרים ושתים אותיות שלש אמות שבע כפולות ושתים עשרה פשוטות.

[14] I translate "primary letters" rather than the literal "mothers" in accordance with the understanding of this word in the early commentators. Saadya, as we shall see, equates it with the Arabic אצול (= יסודות), and so Dunash (Vajda-Fenton, text p. 234, trans. 101), while Judah ben Barzillai explains it as the equivalent of שרשים.

LMNSFPIR collated to K:

יסוד I. נתיבות [ספירות om MNFI. ושבע כפולות [כפולות L ... R. פשותות] add יסוד I.

§ 2 in the Long Recension occurs only in Mss A and D

E collated to Z:

עשרים, E* om [עשר.. אותיות E^mg. ושתים אותיות יסוד

Notes on the text of § 2

This paragraph is not securely anchored in the textual tradition of SY. It is missing in most Mss of the Long Recension and Ms Q in the Short (which as we have just seen comes closest to preserving the earliest recoverable state of § 1).[15] The contents of § 2 are basically repeated in § 9 where, again, the material seems to be out of place, all the Mss of the Short Recension having that paragraph in its logical place after § 16, introducing the second part of the book which deals with the twenty-two letters. Gruenwald (1973:484) and Weinstock (1972: 35) regard § 2 as a gloss on the words שלשים ושנים נתיבות of the first paragraph. Saadya treats §§ 1–2 as a single unit in his commentary and in Ms C there is no space between §§ 1 and 2. Dunash treats §§ 1–3 as a single unit but Judah Ben Barzillai keeps § 1 separate from §§ 2–3. Shabbetai Donnolo paraphrases rather than quotes exactly but his paraphrase shows how § 2 could easily have arisen as a gloss. After בספר וספר וסיפור he continues:

ואלו הם שלשים ושתים נתיבות פלאות חכמה שחקק יה ה' צבאות את עולמו עשר ספירות בלימה ועשרים ושתים אותיות של תורה שהן יסוד העולם.[16]

In the Mss which have it the paragraph is attested in two forms – a short form, and a longer one in which the twenty-two letters are split up into three groups. The short form is found in Ms A and also in Paris 763 (a Ms which is not used in the edition but whose evidence I will use from time to time).[17] Judah ben Barzillai (Halberstam 1885: 105, 140) has the short form which is presupposed also by Donnolo. The original reading of Ms E has a short form of the text but this is the addition found elsewhere in the longer form (שלש אמות שבע כפולות ושתים עשרה פשוטות); the correction in the margin of E towards the usual longer form of this paragraph is by a later hand. If § 2 arose as a gloss on § 1 then we could detect a process of expansion from this short form to the longer form which appears in most of the Mss.

[15] This omission could be by homoioarcton but see below on the next paragraph and the paragraph order of B^1B^2H. At least for these three Mss the absence of § 2 produces a better overall structure which their archetype would have found more difficult to achieve had § 2 lain before its scribe.

[16] Castelli 1880:34–35.

[17] See the Introduction § 8.3.

בלימה. Some Mss follow Ms D in separating this out into its component parts בלי מה. Mss LRB²D do this fairly consistently wherever it appears in the text, thus making the allusion to Job 26:7 transparent. The allusion is, in any case, apparent from the lack of syntactical connection between עשר ספירות and בלימה. It is impossible to be sure what the original author wrote since he clearly introduces a play on the root בלם in § 5 which would favour the reading בלימה here. Judah ben Barzillai knows of both readings and, though (following Saadya) he favours בלימה with its connection to בלום in § 5 he tells us that others separate the words and understand the meaning to be בלא כלום.[18] Dunash insists, in explicit conflict with Saadya, that the expression is two words, not one (Vajda-Fenton 2002: 53). My translation presupposes that the allusion to Job is the primary reason why the author qualifies עשר ספירות with this word. He is asking the question: what is the foundation/basis on which God has constructed the universe? To which Job 26:7 gives the answer: תלה ארץ על בלי מה (he has suspended the world on *beli ma* – nothing). Hence I take SY § 2 as two parallel nominal clauses with בלי מה and יסוד having approximately the same meaning.[19]

יסוד. This has an uncertain position in the textual tradition of SY. The Saadyan Recension and Mss MNFl[20] in the Short Recension omit it here (as they do in § 9). But in his commentary Saadya assumes that the word is present although he connects it with שלש אמות and not עשרים ושתים אותיות.[21] However, in §§ 17 and 19, where most of the Short Recension Mss omit יסוד, MNFl add it! The Saadyan Recension has the word in § 17 but not § 18. Saadya omits it in § 19. If יסוד belongs to the original form of § 2 it is parallel in meaning to בלימה; if it belongs to a later stage in the evolution of the text then it is an attempt to interpret its meaning. The form יסודן is more securely rooted in the SY tradition in §§ 23, 37 and 45.

אומות/אמות/אימות. See also §§ 9, 17, 23–31. Ms A consistently spells this word אימות. The Saadyan Recension (apart from § 2 – but in his commentary on this paragraph Saadya spells it אומות) fairly consistently spells it אומות. In § 17 Ms Z vocalises it אוּמות. Most other Mss spell it אמות. Scholem connects it to the mishnaic word אוּמָה meaning "foundation."[22] Saadya glosses אומות with the Arabic אצל (origin, root, principle) and, although he accepts that it means "mothers", says that is used metaphorically, to which the clue is the prefixing of יסוד to שלש אומות. A preferable explanation is that אום is just a dialectical variant of אֵם in Rabbinic Hebrew parallel to שׂוּם for שֵׂם (1993: 183).[23]

[18] Halberstam 1885: 140.

[19] Scholem's translation "closed" (1987: 28) – following Saadya, would require the text to read בלומות. Joseph Dan (1993: 22, n. 29) has almost reached the same conclusion as I have.

[20] In Ms l יסוד is found at the end of the paragraph. It looks as though it was not in the scribe's exemplar but he knew of the reading or had another Ms which had it, and so attempted to put it in but in the wrong place!

[21] Kafach 1972: 50, Lambert 1891: 24.

[22] 1962: 25, n. 45, 1987: 30, n. 49.

[23] A. Saenz-Badillos, *A History of the Hebrew Language* (Cambridge 1993), p. 183.

Sefer Yeṣira § 3

K

עשר ספירות בלימה כמספר עשר אצבעות חמש כנגד חמש וברית יחיד מכוונת באמצע בברית[1] לשון ובמילת הצער[2].

The ten *sefirot* are the basis – like the number of the ten fingers, five opposite five, and the covenant of the Unique One is exactly in the middle in the covenant of the tongue and the circumcision of the flesh.

[1] במלת $K^{mg.}$ [2] המעור $K^{mg.}$

LMNSFPIQR collated to K:
[כמספר I. יסוד עשר [עשר מספר LMNSPQ. יחד [יחיד N,יחוד I. בברית] במלת $K^{mg}L$ ... R. הלשון [לשון LNFPIQR. הצער.] המעור $K^{mg}L$ ... IR, השעור Q, add שהיא בין עשר אצבעות רגליו F.

A

עשר ספירות בלימה מספר עשר אצבעות חמש כנגד חמש וברית ייחוד מכוונת באמצע במילת לשון ופה ובמילת המעיר.

The ten *sefirot* are the basis – the number of the ten fingers, five opposite five, and the covenant of unity is exactly in the middle by the word of the tongue and mouth and the circumcision of the flesh.

B^1B^2GH collated to A:
כמספר] מספר B^2GH, כנגד B^1. במילת] om B^1 B^2. ופה] המעור] G. ובפה B^1B^2GH.

C

עשר [ספירות ב]לימה ב[מספר עשר אצבעות] חמש כנגד [חמש וברית יחיד מכונת ב]אמצע במי[לה ולשון ו]פה

The ten *sefirot* are the basis – in the number of the ten fingers, five opposite five, and the creation[24] of the Unique One is exactly in the middle, in word and tongue and mouth.

ZE collated to C:
במלה [במילה Z, *ln* E. ובפה] פה E.

Notes on the text of § 3

This paragraph is missing in Ms D, presumably through homoioarcton – the scribe's eye slipped to the beginning of § 4. Note its position in Mss B^1B^2H – after § 9 which, of course, is almost identical with, in their case, the missing § 2. Hence in these three Mss[25] § 1 is immediately followed by § 4. This produces a structure parallel to §§ 37–38 and §§ 45–46 where, immediately after the introduction of the seven double letters and the twelve simple letters their "seven-ness" and their "twelve-ness" is heavily emphasized by the following paragraph, as in § 4 the "ten-ness" of the *sefirot* is similarly underlined. Possibly we see here at work the editorial flair of some scribe up the transmission line from B^1B^2H, or, given the fixed connection of §§ 37–38 in the Short and Long Recensions and §§ 45–46 in the Long Recension

[24] I am following Saadya's understanding of וברית here.
[25] See the introduction § 8.1 for the connection between these three Mss.

(the Short does not have §46) are these Mss putting us in touch with the original order of these paragraphs? In the Saadyan Recension §3 is followed by §7 and is combined by Saadya into his *halakhah* 1.2. According to the Hebrew translations of Dunash's commentary the text he was working on was close to that of the Short Recension.[26] However, Vajda's reconstruction of Dunash's text presupposes for the second half of the paragraph a formulation somewhere between that of Ms A and the Saadyan Recension: "l'alliance de l'Unique est fixée au milieu, par la parole, la langue et l'alliance de la chair" (Vajda-Fenton 2002: 56). Donnolo paraphrases again, rather than quotes exactly, and there are considerable variations in the Mss cited by Castelli (1880: 35). But it looks like he had before him a text similar to that of Ms A but with המעור rather than המעיר – which he helpfully glosses as שהוא הערוה, referring us to Hab 2:15.

Our witnesses basically agree on the text of this paragraph as far as וברית; thereafter things become quite complex and it is difficult to produce a tidy explanation of how all the variant readings arose.

ייחוד. Apart from Ms I this is confined to the Long Recension. It is easy to see how it could have arisen from יחיד, but the reverse is also possible.

במילת. Most Mss, especially in the Long Recension, have במלת, and we can see the same divergence of spelling between the Genizah Scroll (Ms C) and Saadya. This bears on the issue of whether we have here מִילָה (circumcision) or מִלָּה (word). Unfortunately, both words could be spelt either way. Followed by לשון it would naturally be taken as "word", followed by המעור as "circumcision." That would give us a nice play on words. But would this play take us back to the earliest form of the text? Not if we followed the Saadyan version which does not have it at all. Saadya also has a radically different understanding of this paragraph from all the other interpreters since he reads וברית as וְבְרִיַּת (=ובריאת) and translates "and one body is placed exactly in the middle." He understands this to be a reference to human beings as the creation of God placed in the middle of the universe surrounded by the ten *sefirot*, i.e. the dimensions of space and the basic elements as explained later in the text. He denies the view that the reference is here to the "covenant."[27] This way of taking the text would be fully congruent with the basic assumptions of SY about humanity's place within the universe. There is no other secure reference to "circumcision" in SY since the mention of it in §61 is missing in Ms C.

One possible explanation of how these divergent texts arose would be to assume that the Saadyan version is the earliest[28] and that Saadya correctly understood the

---

[26] It is interesting to note that Moses ben Joseph's translation has the same error (?) of השעור for המעור as Ms Q but Dunash's commentary assumes that he was expounding ובמילת המעור.

[27] קד יצחף האהנה ויקאל וברית יחיד עלי סביל אלעהד וליס אלחק כד׳לך – "and sometimes they make a mistake here and say that וברית יחיד means "covenant", but this is incorrect" (Kafach 1972: 52, Lambert 1891: 26). Ben-Shammai (1988: 6) suggests that Saadya may have drawn his understanding of ברית from an earlier commentary on SY.

[28] The shortest text is actually in Paris 763 which omits everything after באמצע.

intention of the author. But then subsequently ברית was understood in the light of § 61 which, as we shall see, has itself undergone substantial expansion in the course of time. The gloss in Ms F (שהיא בין עשר אצבעות רגליו), which Donnolo also has, shows this process at work. Then ובמילת המעור was added (as in Ms A) to make the reference to the Abrahamic covenant quite clear. Then במילת was introduced before לשון; it is missing in Mss B^1B^2H. This produces the nice play on words. Finally, ופה was removed in the Short Recension to produce the even better balance of במילת לשון ובמילת המעור – so Gruenwald (1973: 488). The change from יחיד to יחוד fits in with this shift in the orientation of § 3. If some such process as this took place then it parallels other changes to the text of SY which had the effect of making it a more religious text.[29]

המעיר. This must be an error in Ms A though we also find it in Judah ben Barzillai (according to Halberstam 1885: 105, 140). However, Judah's subsequent comments assume that he is expounding a reading המעיד (testifies).[30] Another error is הצער in Ms K, corrected in the margin to המעור. There are signs in the Ms of an attempt to write over the צ. Whether בברית in K is also an error is difficult to say since it makes good sense. The corrector of the Ms obviously thought it was a mistake.

Weinstock (1972:36–37) regards most of the second half of this paragraph as a series of additions to the original text and וברית ייחוד מכוונת באמצע he emends to ומכון יחיד באמצע (and the dwelling-place of the Unique One in the centre). The suggestion is interesting but has no support in the extant Mss, though he could have cited Paris 763 to support his relegation of במילת לשון ובמילת המעור to secondary status. His reconstruction of SY § 3 is subjected to devastating criticism by Nicolas Séd in his review of Gruenwald and Weinstock's editions.[31]

Sefer Yeṣira § 4

C	A	K
[עשר ספירות] בלימה עשר ולא תשע עשר ולא [עשתי עשרה הבין] בחכמה וחכם בבינה בחון בהם [וחקור מהן ודע וחשב] וצור והעמיד דבר על בוראו והשו[ב יוצר על מכונו]	עשר ספירות בלימה עשר ולא תשע עשר ולא אחת עשרה הבין בחכמה וחכום בבינה בחון בהם וחקור בהן דע וחשוב וצור והעמד דבר על בוריו והשב יוצר על מכונו ומידתן עשר שאין להן סוף.	עשר ספירות בלימה עשר ולא תשע, עשר ולא אחת עשרה. הבן בחכמה, וחכם בבינה. בחון בהם וחקור מהם והעמד דבר על בריו והשב יוצר על מכונו.

[29] See Hayman 1984, 1987, 1993.

[30] D. Kaufmann, in his notes and corrections to Halberstam's edition (p. 311) says that on p.40 the Ms reads המעור.

[31] Séd 1973: 519–522.

The ten *sefirot* are the basis – ten and not nine, ten and not eleven. Understand with wisdom, and be wise with understanding. Test them and investigate them, and get the thing clearly worked out and restore the Creator to his place.

The ten *sefirot* are the basis – ten and not nine, ten and not eleven. Understand with wisdom, and be wise with understanding. Test them and investigate them. Know and ponder and form (a mental image). Get the thing clearly worked out and restore the Creator to his place. And their measure is ten for they have no limit.

The ten *sefirot* are the basis – ten and not nine, ten and not eleven. Understand with wisdom, and be wise with understanding. Test them and investigate them. Know and ponder and form (a mental image). Get the thing clearly worked out and restore the Creator to his place.

D

עשר ספירות בלי מה עשר ולא תשע עשר ולא אחת עשרה הבן בחכמה וחכם בבינה כחון בהם וחקור מהם דע וחשוב וצור והעמד דבר על בוריו והשב יוצר על מכונו.

Z

עשר ספירות בלימה עשר ולא תשע עשר ולא עשתי עשרה הבין בחכמה וחכם בבינה בחון בהם וחקור מהן ודע וחשב וצור והעמד דבר על בירורו והושב יוצר על מכונו.

LMNSFPIQR collated to K:
מהם] add דע וחשוב וצור L, דע וחשוב ובור R.

B^1B^2GH collated to A:
וצור] om G. מכונו] מושבו B^1*, add כי הוא יוצר ובורא לבדו ואין זולתו B^1B^2GH. ומדתו] ומדות B^1, ומידתן H.

E collated to Z:
בירורו] והושב E. והשב] בריו E.

Notes on the text of § 4

At this point the Saadyan Recension makes a decisive break with the order of the material as we find it in the other two recensions. § 4, together with § 8, is placed at the beginning of Saadya's chapter two. As we have already observed, § 3 is combined with § 7 as chapter 1.2 in his version. It is followed then by §§ 9, 23, 37a, 45, 58a and 59a to complete his chapter one. The first four chapters of the Saadyan Recension completely reorganise the material of SY on a different principle from that of the other recensions. Instead of treating the ten *sefirot*, the three mothers, the seven doubles, and the twelve simple letters in that order, each chapter in turn treats all four sequentially; see Weinstock 1981: 33. But the paragraph order from here to § 10 is also disrupted in the other recensions. Weinstock argues that all the existing witnesses have corrupted the original order but the Short Recension is the "least worse (1972: 24)." He restores the "original" order as follows: 1, 3, 7, 8, 6, 4, 5 (1972: 58). Gruenwald also attempts to restore the original order at this point to: 4, 6, 7, 5, 8. The arguments produced by Weinstock and Gruenwald to support their

proposed re-ordering are not compelling, especially when they come to different conclusions, and the matter is best left open.

A plausible reconstruction of the growth of § 4 is as follows:

(1) The earliest recoverable stage is in Mss K and M–Q in the Short Recension, supported by Judah ben Barzillai[32] and Dunash ben Tamim.[33]

(2) Ms D, the Saadyan Recension, and LR in the Short Recension add the phrase דע וחשוב וצור. Gruenwald (1973: 489) notes the absence of this phrase in the Short Recension Mss of §§ 6 and 24 and remarks that צור in the sense in which it is has here "is mostly found in medieval literature."

(3) Ms A, and most Long Recension Mss, add at the end of the paragraph ומידתן עשר שאין להן סוף. This phrase occurs at the beginning of § 6, inside § 7 in the Short and Long Recensions (probably the most logical place for it), at the beginning of § 7 in the Saadyan Recension and linking together §§ 4 and 8 in Saadya's chapter 2:1. Some scribes were clearly unsure where it properly belonged.

(4) The Long Recension Mss B^1B^2GH add כי הוא יוצר ובורא לבדו ואין זולתו, a gloss which reflects the Long Recension form of § 6.

בוריו. This is the Long Recension spelling. Most Mss of the Short Recension have בריו without the vowel letter. Ms E's reading in agreement with this suggests that בוראו (his creator) in Ms C is an error occasioned by יוצר in the next clause, possibly because the scribe did not understand this rare idiom (for which see *b Git.* 89b.). Saadya's reading is a clarification which does not actually alter the meaning.

והשב. This looks like the Hiphil imperative of שוב, but Saadya reads והושב which is clearly from ישב. Allony (1972: 72, n.56) is sure that the form השב is to be taken as the Hiphil of ישב because of the two-root letter theory which he sees as fundamental to the author's outlook. Weinstock too (1972: 42, n.5) thinks that there is no real variant here and that השב is simply a defective Palestinian spelling of הושב though he does not cite any evidence to support this assertion. Gruenwald suggests that "the reading והושב found in Se'adya's text seems to be induced as a contrast to the previous והעמד. In any case, nothing significant is introduced by it" (1973: 489). But there is a real difference between "restore" and "seat" and the former (which, after all is the reading of all the Mss except one) may take us deep into the author's basic thinking; see Hayman 1986: 181–82.[34]

ומידתן. The reading ומדתו in Mss B^1 (cf. ומדות in H) recurs in § 6 where they are joined by Ms G, while G alone has this reading in § 7. This looks like a tendentious kabbalistic alteration identifying the *sefirot* as attributes of God.

---

[32] Judah has at one point a very short text (Halberstam 1885: 31) but later on (pp. 105, 144) he quotes a text almost identical with that of K.

[33] According to the Hebrew version of Moses ben Joseph (Vajda-Fenton 2002: 219) and Oxford 2250 (Grossberg 1902: 26). However, Vajda's reconstruction of Dunash's text (*ibid.* 57) contains the addition found in my proposed stage (2). Its presence is not presupposed in Dunash's comment on this passage. Unfortunately, the beginning of the Arabic text of Dunash's commentary is missing in the Geniza fragments.

[34] For a contrary opinion see Liebes 2000: 143–44.

Sefer Yeṣira § 5

K

עשר ספירות בלימה בלום פיך מלדבר בלום לבך מלהרהר ואם רץ לבך שוב למקום שכך נאמר כרצוא ושוב[1] ועל דבר זה נכרת ברית.

The ten *sefirot* are the basis: restrain your mouth from speaking, restrain your heart from thinking. And if your heart races return to the Place, for thus it is written: (like) *running and returning* (Ezek 1:14). And concerning this matter the covenant was made.

[1] רצוא ושוב K[mg]

A

עשר ספירות בלימה בלום ליבך מלהרהר בלום פיך מלדבר ואם רץ ליבך שוב למקום שיצאתה ממנו וזכור שכך נאמר והחיות רצוא ושוב ועל דבר זה נכרת ברית

The ten *sefirot* are the basis: restrain your heart from thinking; restrain your mouth from speaking. And if your heart races return to the place where you started, and remember that thus it is written: *And the living creatures ran to and fro* (Ezek.1:14). And concerning this matter a covenant was made.

C

עשר ספירות בלימה בלם פיך מלדבר בלם מלהרהר ואם רץ ליבך שוב למקום כמשתמר רצוא ושוב ועל דבר זה נכרתה ברית

The ten *sefirot* are the basis: restrain your mouth from speaking, restrain your heart from thinking. And if your heart races return (it) to (its) place, for thus it is written: *running and returning* (Ezek 1:14). And concerning this matter the covenant was made.[35]

I

עשר ספירות בלימה בלום פיך מלהרהר בהם בלום פיך מלדבר ואם רץ לבך שוב למקום שכך נאמר רצוא ושוב ועל דבר זה נכרת ברית.

LMNSFPQR collated to K:
בלום R. מלהרהר [מלדבר
ולבך [לבך L ... R. שוב]
ישוב MN.כרצוא [רצוא
K[mg]L ... R.
דבר] om M*N.

D

עשר ספירות בלי מה בלום פיך מלדבר ולבך מלהרהר ואם ירוץ[1] לבך שוב למקום שנאמר לכך רצוא ושוב ועל דבר זה נכרת ברית.

[1] ירוץ D[mg]

B[1]B[2]GH collated to A:
פיך [ליבך G. שיצאתה ממנו
וזכור] om B[1]B[2]GH.

Z

עשר ספירות בלימה בלום פיך מלדבר בלום לבך מלהרהר ואם רץ ליבך שוב למקום שכך נאמר רצוא ושוב ועל דבר זה נכרתה ברית

E collated to Z:
מלדבר בלם] om E*.
ולבך [לבך E*. נאמר] om E.

Notes on the text of § 5

In the Saadyan Recension § 5 begins chapter 3 where it is combined (without a break) with § 6, as it is in Ms A. However, in his translation Saadya clearly sepa-

[35] Ms C in this paragraph is too corrupt to serve as a basis for the translation of the Saadyan Recension. I have, therefore, translated the text of Ms Z here, according to the understanding of it conveyed by Saadya's Arabic translation.

rates the two sayings, introducing each of them with ומעני קולנא (and the meaning of our saying).[36] In the Short Recension § 5 comes after § 6 and before § 10.

There are a number of relatively minor differences between the Mss but only one major one. This is the addition of שיצאתה ממנו וזכור after למקום in Ms A. This reflects one of the two ways in which the ambiguous word מקום was understood by the early commentators. Is it a divine name – the Place or Omnipresent[37] or just the ordinary noun "place"? In § 6 Mss KLSFR and Judah ben Barzillai clearly use המקום as a divine name where the Long Recension Mss have (ב"ה) הקדוש. Shabbetai Donnolo even reads לאלהים here (Castelli 1880: 38) which leaves no ambiguity about how it should be understood. Ms A clearly reflects the understanding of the text which we find in Saadya's translation: "ten closed numbers: close your mouth from speaking too much about them and close your heart from thinking about them, and if your thinking gets out of hand (lit. runs) return it to its place, as it is said about the angels: *being present and returning*." When Judah ben Barzillai first cites § 5 he reads החזירהו למקומו (Halberstam 1885: 31) which looks like a straight translation back into Hebrew of Saadya's translation. When he quotes the paragraph again he reads שוב למקומו (*ibid.* 105, 165). There can be little doubt that this isolated reading in Ms A is an interpretative gloss. The addition of בהם in Ms I after מלהרהר reflects the same need that Saadya obviously felt to spell out what it is that must not be thought about.

The order of the phrases בלום פיך מלדבר/ בלום לבך מלהרהר is reversed in the Long Recension, and most Mss of the Short Recension do not repeat בלום. Note also the readings of Mss R and G. Weinstock (1972: 43, n.3) deduces from this that בלום לבך מלהרהר was originally a marginal gloss to לבך in the next clause, and was inserted in different places in the early Mss. This is possible but unprovable in the absence of any Ms which has only one of these clauses.

Ms D and all the Short and Saadyan Recension Mss do not have והחיות. As Gruenwald remarks (1973: 490), this addition misses the point of the allusion to Ezek 1:14 which is simply to "going backwards and forwards." Such readings, where more or less of a biblical quotation is included in the text, are among the commonest variants in medieval Hebrew Mss but the addition of והחיות here may be of real significance since Gruenwald thinks that it laid the text wide open to kabbalistic interpretation.

The generally poor state of the text of SY in the Genizah Scroll can be clearly seen in this paragraph. Weinstock (in Allony 1981a: 19) is almost certainly correct in seeing כמשתמר as an error for כמ' שנאמר, in contrast to Liebes (2000: 35, n.2) who does not refer to Weinstock's opinion. Liebes' further attempt (p. 54) to see a connection between SY § 5 and Deut 4:15 is built on a shaky textual foundation.

---

[36] Kafach 1972: 90, Lambert 1891: 55.

[37] See Marmorstein 1927: 92–93, Urbach 1979: I, 66–69.

The text of Ms Paris 770 at this point is a striking example of the freedom felt by some scribes to rewrite the text they are copying.[38] From ואם onwards it reads: ואם קץ פיך לדבר ולבך להרהר שוב למקום כי על דבר זה נכרת ברית (and if your mouth detests speaking and your heart thinking, return to the Place because concerning this matter a covenant was made). This deletes the biblical quotation entirely and gets rid of the difficult phrase רץ וליבך. It is difficult to see how it relates to the rest of the textual tradition of SY and can only be a free rewrite.

Sefer Yeṣira § 6

K

עשר ספירות בלימה נעוץ סופן בתחילתן[1] כשלהבת קשורה בגחלת שאדון יחיד ואין שיני לו ולפני אחד מה אתה סופר

The ten *sefirot* are the basis. Their end is fixed in their beginning as the flame is bound to the burning coal. For the Lord is unique, and he has none second to him; and before one, what can you count?

[1] ותחילתן בסופן add K^{mg}.

A

ומידתן עשר שאין להן סוף נעוץ סופן בתחילתן ותחילתן בסופן כשלהבת קשורה בגחלת דע וחשוב וצור שאדון יחיד והיוצר אחד ואין לו שיני ולפני אחד מה אתה סופר.

And their measure is ten for they have no limit. Their end is fixed in their beginning, and their beginning in their end, as the flame is bound to the burning coal. Know and ponder, and form (a mental image) that the Lord is unique and the Creator one, and he has none second to him; and before one, what can you count?

C

ומידתן עשר שאן לה סוף נעוץ סופן בתחלתן ותחלתן בסופן כשלהבת בגחלת דע וחשב וצור שהיוצר אחד ואן בלעדיו ולפני אחד מה אתה סופר.

And their measure is ten for they have no limit. Their end is fixed in their beginning, and their beginning in their end, as the flame is bound to the burning coal. Know and ponder, and form (a mental image) that the Creator is one, and there is none other than him; and before one, what can you count?

D

עשר ספירות בלי מה נעוץ סופן בתחלתן ותחלתן בסופן כשלהבת קשורה בגחלת דע וחשב וצור שאדון יחיד והיוצר אחד ואין לו שני ולפני אחד מה אתה סופר.

Z

ומידתן עשר שאין להן סוף נָעוץ סופן בתחילתן ותחילתן בסופן כשלהבת קשורה בגחלת דע וחשב וצור שהיוצר אחד ואין בלעדיו ולפני אחד מה אתה סופר.

LMNSFPIQR collated to K:
ותחילתן בסופן] add K^{mg}
FR. נעוצה קשורה] Q.
קורא וסופר סופר] Q.

B^{1}B^{2}GH collated to A:
ומידתן] מדתו B^{1}GH. ...סופן
סופו בתחילתו] בסופן
וצור H.] ותחילתו בסופו
ועוד G.

E = Z:

[38] See the Introduction § 8.2 for my reasons for not including this Ms in the textual apparatus.

Notes on the text of § 6.

Again the Short Recension matches up to its name and offers a shorter text which is supported by Judah ben Barzillai whose citations almost entirely agree with Ms K (Halberstam 1885: 31, 105, 163). The main differences between the Recensions and the Mss are:

(1) Ms A, the other Long Recension Mss with the exception of D, and the Saadyan Recension begin the paragraph with ומידתן עשר שאין להן סוף, whereas the Short Recension has עשר ספירות בלימה. See the notes on § 4. The overall pattern of §§ 2–10 would suggest that the Short Recension has the correct reading here. Weinstock sees ומידתן עשר שאין להן סוף throughout chapter one as an addition and similarly עשר ספירות בלימה everywhere except at the beginning of § 3. But עשר ספירות בלימה is fairly well rooted in the textual tradition in §§ 2–5, 10, while ומידתן עשר שאין להן סוף is securely rooted in § 7, though fluctuating in position elsewhere.

(2) ותחילתן בסופן is absent in most Short Recension Mss and Weinstock relegates it to his third layer (1972: 40). However, we have a similar rhetorical structure in § 4 on the pattern a:b/b:a, so the phrase may have been accidentally omitted from an ancestor of most of these Mss.

(3) קשורה is absent in the Genizah Scroll and Ms Q (reading נעוצה) shows another way of filling the gap between כשלהבת and בגחלת. Weinstock (*ibid.* 40, n.4) may be correct in seeing קשורה as a later addition.

(4) דע וחשוב וצור is absent in all the Short Recension Mss and in Judah ben Barzillai.[39] There is no obvious mechanical explanation for it as an omission, so it is almost certainly a later addition. See the notes to § 4. It looks like a standard Long Recension addition to the Short Recension.

(5) In the second half of the paragraph the Short and Saadyan Recensions have two clauses governed by the conjunction ש. They disagree in their readings though the meaning is more or less the same. The Long Recension has an extra clause and seems to have taken היוצר אחד from the Saadyan Recension and combined it with the two clauses of the Short Recension. Weinstock (*ibid.* 41, n.6) argues that only the single clause שהיוצר אחד הוא is original. He relegates ואין לו שיני to his layer four, while he thinks that the clause שאדון יחיד was suggested by אדון יחיד in § 7. He may well be right but, as far as the texual evidence we actually have goes, we can only say that one of these three clauses is certainly a later addition, but we cannot be sure which one.

[39] It does appear in Oxford, Bodleian Poc. 256, used by Allony 1981: 80. But this is a late Ms (1456 C.E.) and, despite Allony's note (*ibid.* 102) can hardly count against the weight of all the other Short Recension Mss. It is, in any case, a Ms of a commentary on SY. Ms P also has this addition as part of a marginal reading showing awareness of the difference at this point between the recensions: סא' [= ספר אחר] אתה דע וחשוב וצור כי היוצר אחד הוא ואין בלעדיו ולפני.

On the reading מדתו in B[1]GH see the notes to §4. The reading סופו בתחילתו ותחילתו בסופו may reflect the same *tendenz*, if it is not a straight error – *Waw* for *Nun*.

Sefer Yeṣira § 7

C

[ומידתן עשר שאין להן] סוף
עומק ראשית ועומק [אחרית
עומק רום ועומק תחת] עומק
טוב ועומק ר[ע עומק מזרח
ועומק מערב עומק צפון]
ועומק דרום ואדון יחיד אל
מ[לך נאמן] מושל בכולן]
מ]עון קדשו עד עדי [עד]

And their measure is ten for they have no limit: dimension of beginning and dimension of end, dimension of above and dimension of below, dimension of good and dimension of evil, dimension of east and dimension of west, dimension of north and dimension of south. And the unique Lord, a trustworthy divine king, rules over them all from his holy abode for ever and ever.

A

עשר ספירות בלימה ומידתן
עשר שאין להן סוף עומק
ראשית ועומק אחרית עומק
טוב ועומק רע עומק רום
ועומק תחת עומק מזרח
ועומק מערב עומק צפון
ועומק דרום ואדון יחיד
אל מלך נאמן מושל בכולן
ממעון קדשו ועד עדי עד

The ten *sefirot* are the basis and their measure is ten for they have no limit: dimension of beginning and dimension of end, dimension of good and dimension of evil, dimension of above and dimension of below, dimension of east and dimension of west, dimension of north and dimension of south. And the unique Lord, a trustworthy divine king, rules over them all from his holy abode for ever and ever.

K

עשר ספירות בלימה מדתן
עשר שאין להם סוף. עומק
ראשית ועומק אחרית, עומק
טוב ועומק רע, עומק רום,
עומק תחת, עומק מזרח, עומק
מערב, עומק צפון ועומק
דרום. ואדון יחיד אל מלך
נאמן מושל בכולן ממעון
קדשו ועד עדי עד

The ten *sefirot* are the basis; their measure is ten for they have no limit: dimension of beginning and dimension of end, dimension of good and dimension of evil, dimension of above and dimension of below, dimension of east and dimension of west, dimension of north and dimension of south. And the unique Lord, a trustworthy divine king, rules over them all from his holy abode for ever and ever.

K[mg] עדי עד [ועד עדי עד

Z

ומידתן עשר שאין להן סוף
עומק ראשית ועומק אחרית
עומק טוב ועומק רע. עומק
רום ועומק תחת עומק מזרח
ועומק מערב עומק צפון
ועומק דרום ואדון יחיד
אל מלך נאמן מושל בכולן
ממעון קדשו ועד עדי עד.

M

עשר ספירות בלימה מדתן
עשר שאין להם סוף. עומק
ראשית ועומק אחרית עומק
רום, עומק תחת עומק טוב
ועומק רע עומק מזרח, עומק
מערב עומק צפון ועומק דרום
ואדון יחיד אל מלך נאמן
מושל בכולן ממעון קדשו ועד
עדי עד

LN...R collated to K. No significant variants	B^1B^2DGH collated to A: בלימה] om B^1. ומידתן] om B^1, מדתו G. רום] מעלה G. ועד] om B^1G. מטה] תחת	E = C exactly

Notes on the text of § 7

As Gruenwald notes (1973: 495f), the description of the *sefirot* presented in this paragraph is not easy to harmonise with the one which follows in §§ 10–16. However, Weinstock's resolution of the problem (1972: 38,59) by relegating the whole of §§ 10–16 to his first layer of additions to the original SY is not based on any text-critical evidence.[40] There is remarkable unanimity among the Mss over the text of § 7. There is only one minor variant worthy of note: Ms Z follows the order of the dimensions as in the Long and Short Recensions, whereas the Short Recension Ms M follows the order of CE. This probably reflects an early transpositional error which spread into the manuscript tradition of CE. It is clearly more logical for the dimensions of space to be kept together as in §§ 15 and 16. The substitution of מעלה for רום and מטה for תחת in G also appears in § 16 scattered around the recensions, and probably reflects contamination from § 15. For מדתו in G see above on §§ 4 and 6. The omission of ועד in K^{mg} and G (and also in Donnolo and Dunash) reflects the influence of Isa 26:4. The omission of עשר ספירות בלימה in the Saadyan Recension is due to the fact that it combines §§ 3 and 7 into one statement (Saadya's chapter 1:2). The paragraph is cited in the Midrash *Lekach Tob* (Buber 1884: 2) where it substitutes ועומק אור ועומק חשך for עומק טוב ועומק רע. However, none of our Mss attests this reading and the author of *Lekach Tob*, Tobias ben Eliezer, is not noted for accurate citation of his sources. The way he runs parts of SY §§ 8, 7 and 5 together at this point suggests that he is quoting erroneously from memory.

Sefer Yeṣira § 8

K	A	C
עשר ספירות בלימה צפיתן כמראה הבזק ותכליתם אין להן קץ׳ ודברו בהן כרצוא ושוב ולמאמרו כסופה ירדופו ולפני כסאו הם משתחוים	עשר ספירות בלימה צפייתן כמראה הבזק ותכליתן אין בהן קץ דברו בהן כרצוא ולמאמרו כסופה ירדופו ולפני כסאו הן משתחוים.	ומידתן עשר שאין להן סוף צפי[יתן כמראה בזק] ותכליתם אן להן קץ ודברו בהן כרצוא [ושוב] ולמאמרו כסופה ירדפו ולפני כסאו הם מש[תחוים].

[40] On this problem see Dan 1993: 23, n. 30.

The ten *sefirot* are the basis. Their appearance is like the sight of lightning, and their end? – they have no limit. And his word is in them *as though running and returning* (Ezek.1:14), and they pursue his command like the storm wind, and before his throne they bow down.

The ten sefirot are the basis. Their appearance is like the sight of lightning, and their end? – they have no limit. His word is in them *as though running* (Ezek.1:14), and they pursue his command like the storm wind, and before his throne they bow down.

And their measure is ten for they have no limit. Their appearance is like the sight of lightning, and their end? – they have no limit. And his word is in them *as though running and returning* (Ezek.1:14), and they pursue his command like the storm wind, and before his throne they bow down.

[1] סוף K^{mg}.

LMNSFPIQR collated to K:
ותכליתם] ותכלית MN. קץ] סוף $K^{mg}MNPQ$, קץ ולא סוף I. ולמאמרו] ועל מאמרו MN.

B^1B^2DGH collated to A:
בלימה] om B^1B^2H. צפייתן] צפייתו B^1. ותכליתן] ותכליתו B^1. אין] עד אין B^1B^2H. להם] להן B^1B^2GH, לה D. כרצוא] add שוב G, ברצוא ושוב B^2DH (ln B^1).

ZE collated to C:
צפייתן] צְפִיּוֹנָן Z.

Notes on the text of § 8

Like the preceding paragraph, the text of § 8 is reasonably stable. In the Saadyan Recension it is combined with § 4 forming Saadya's chapter 2:1, and this explains the omission of the usual introductory phrase עשר ספירות בלימה and the substitution of ומידתן עשר שאין להן סוף. See the notes to §§ 6 and 7. Rather than using Saadya's rare form צְפִיּוֹנָן I have restored the text of Ms C according to Ms E which agrees with all the other witnesses in reading צפייתן. סוף for קץ in $K^{mg}MNPQ$ is an obvious correction to the ומידתן עשר שאין להן סוף from the previous paragraph but may also be an attempt to get in a reference to אין סוף; see Weinstock 1972: 39, n.4. The reading of Ms I is interesting with its insistence that קץ is the correct reading. The weight of evidence supports Ms I's scribe here. Donnolo (Castelli 1980: 37) combines both readings: אין להן סוף וקץ. The singular suffix on צפייתו and ותכליתו in B^1 presumably reflects the same attempt to turn these paragraphs into a description of God (with the *sefirot* as his attributes) as we find in its text of §§ 6 and 7 – if it is not just an error.

Instead of ירדופו Weinstock (1972: 40) reads ידרוכו on the basis of the Hebrew text cited in the Genizah Ms of the Arabic text of Dunash's commentary (Taylor-Schechter 307[5], line 3, Vajda 1963: 152). Vajda transcribes this as ירדופו but the photograph (*ibid.* 154) shows that Weinstock is correct. He cites Nahum 1:3 in support – בסופו ובשערו דרכו. However, Dunash's commentary on its own is insufficient support to outweigh the united testimony of all our other Mss in favour of ירדופו. The biblical passage, on the contrary, may show how the variant arose.

Sefer Yeṣira § 9

K

עשרים ושתים אותיות יסוד שלש אמות שבע כפולות ושתים עשרה פשוטות.

The twenty-two letters are the foundation: three primary letters, seven double (letters), and twelve simple (letters).

A

עשר ספירות בלימה ועשרים ושתים אותיות יסוד שלש אימות ושבע כפולות ושתים עשרה פשוטות ורוח אחת מהן.

The ten *sefirot* are the basis and the twenty-two letters are the foundation: three mothers, seven double (letters), and twelve simple (letters). And the Spirit is one of them.

C

עש[רים] ושתים אותיות יסוד שלוש אומות שבע כפולות ושתים עשרה פשוטות

The twenty-two letters are the foundation: three primary letters, seven double (letters), and twelve simple (letters).

D

עשרים ושתים אותיות יסוד שלש אמות ושבע כפולות ושתים עשרה שפותות ורוח אחת מהן.

LMNSFPIQR collated to K:
יסוד] om MFIQ

B^1B^2GH collated to A:
יסוד] om B^1. בכל [אחת אחת B^1B^2GH.

ZE collated to C:
אמות [אומות E.

Notes on the text of § 9

§ 9, as we have already seen, more or less repeats § 2. In the Short Recension it comes after § 16 at the beginning of the second part of the book which deals with the twenty-two letters. In this position the initial phrase found at the beginning of the Long Recension (עשר ספירות בלימה) would be quite out of place. After § 16 and before § 17 does, however, seem the more logical place for this paragraph and, indeed, it is repeated there in the Long Recension. עשר ספירות בלימה, then, is most likely an addition which fits § 9 in the Long Recension into the overall pattern of §§ 2–5, 7–8, 10 which all begin with this phrase. It may be significant that Ms D agrees with the other recensions in omitting the phrase. But note the position of § 9 in Ms D – between §§ 12 and 13, which may be related to the Short Recension's incorporation of § 9 within § 12. In B^1B^2H § 9 is placed between §§ 8 and 3 while Ms G follows the order of Ms A, though it does not have § 10. The fluctuating position of § 9 within the Long Recension itself reinforces the conclusion that it is out of place in §§ 1–10 and originally belonged elsewhere. Of the three commentators who generally follow the order of the Short Recension, Judah ben Barzillai places

§ 9 after § 16 and before § 19a, Donnolo places it after § 16 and before § 17, while Dunash does not seem to have had it at all or, at least, chose to ignore it in his commentary (see Vajda-Fenton 2002: 83, n.1).

In the Saadyan Recension § 9 performs the same function as it does in the other recensions. It introduces us to the treatment of the twenty-two letters which, in this Recension, takes us immediately to the three mothers (§ 23), the seven doubles (§ 37a), and the twelve simple letters (§ 45). But it is then reused at the start of the second run through the letters (ch. 2:2) – §§ 24a, 38, 46–47, 18, 58b. And similarly for the third and fourth runs (chapters 3:2 and 4:3). It is significant that in the fourth run through § 9 immediately precedes § 17 as in Mss SPR in the Short Recension and all the Long Recension Mss. Thus the use of § 9 in the Saadyan Recension reinforces the conclusion that it has its proper place and function as we find it in the Short Recension.

יסוד. On the uncertain place of this word in the SY text tradition see the notes on § 2.

ורוח (בכל) אחת מהן (Long Recension). This phrase properly belongs to § 12 where it is attested in all three recensions. Gruenwald (1973: 497) says that these words "are added here in order to bridge between this paragraph and the next one which discusses the first *sefira*, "the Spirit of God"." So Weinstock 1972: 48, n.1.

Sefer Yeṣira § 10

K

עשר ספירות כלומר אחת רוח אלהים חיים ברוך ומבורך שמו שלחי העולמים. קול ורוח ודבר. וזה הוא רוח הקודש.

Ten *sefirot*, that is to say:[41] one – the Spirit of the Living God. Twice blessed is the name of the Life of the Worlds. Voice, and air (*ruah*) and word – this is the Holy Spirit (*ruah*).

A

עשר ספירות בלימה אחת רוח אלהים חיים. נכון כסאו מאז [fol. 66b] .ברוך ומבורך שמו שלחי העולמים לעולם ועד קול ורוח ודיבור זו היא רוח הקודש

The ten *sefirot* are the basis: one – the Spirit of the Living God. *His throne is established from of old* (Ps 93:2). Twice blessed is the name of the Life of the Worlds. Voice, and air (*ruah*) and speech -- this is the Holy Spirit (*ruah*).

C

עשר ספירות בלימה אחת רוח אלהים חיים חי העולמים נכון כסאו מאז ברוך ומבורך שמו תמיד לעולם ועד ועד זו היא רוח הקודש.

The ten *sefirot* are the basis: one – the Spirit of the Living God, the Life of the Worlds. *His throne is established from of old* (Ps 93:2). Twice blessed is his name always for ever and ever. This is the Holy Spirit.

[41] All other Short Recension Mss and all the Mss of the other recensions read בלימה here. Ms K's כלומר is clearly an idiosyncratic reading, and so the translation of the Short Recension should be "The ten *sefirot* are the basis."

D

עשר ספירות בלי מה אחת
היא רוח אלהים חיים נכון
כסאו מאז ברוך ומבורך שמו
אל חי העולמים תמיד לעולם
ועד קול ורוח מרוח ודבר זה
היא רוח הקדש.

LMNSFPIQR collated to K: בלימה [כלומר L ... R. שמו] add לעולם I. ודבר [ודבור F. וזו היא LSPI. הוא [וזה הוא] om MNQ.

B^2H collated to A: [נכון כסאו מאז om H. [ומבורך.העולמים] add תמיד B^2H.

ZE collated to C: תמיד] om E. ועד 2^0] om ZE.

Notes on the text of § 10

In the Saadyan Recension § 10, followed immediately by § 12, begins the fourth run through the *sefirot* and the twenty-two letters (= Saadya's ch. 4:1). In the other recensions it introduces a relatively stable section with regard at least to the order of the paragraphs (§§ 10–16). Mss B^1 and G omit this paragraph entirely, most probably because the scribe's eye slipped from the introductory phrase of § 3 to that of § 11 in the case of B^1 and from 9 to 11 in the case of G.

We could suggest four stages in the growth of this paragraph:

(1) A simple statement identifying the first *sefirah* as the Spirit of the Living God, identified in turn with the Holy Spirit: עשר ספירות בלימה אחת רוח אלהים חיים זו היא רוח הקודש. This represents basically all the material which the recensions have in common. Gruenwald (1972: 497–98) makes a convincing case here that "paragraphs 10, 12, 13 and 14 did not originally contain anything but the names of the *sefirot*." He is rather too modest in stating that "there is no textual evidence for it", since it seems at least for § 10 that isolating what the recensions have in common produces precisely such a relatively unadorned statement. Weinstock (1972:44, n.1) relegates the whole of §§ 10–16 to his second and later layers of the SY tradition, because the identification of the *sefirot* in §§ 10–14 does not square with that offered in § 7. However, using internal self-consistency as a text-critical criterion in SY (or any other ancient Jewish text) has to be done with the greatest of caution. Our author was not necessarily a logical or consistent thinker!

(2) The addition of the phrase קול ורוח ודיבור – not present in the Saadyan Recension. Weinstock (*ibid.* 45, n. 8) rightly calls this a "conspicuous enigmatic addition." The purpose it serves is not clear. Gruenwald (*ibid.* 500) comments that "the three words may well point to possible Logos-speculations which lie at the bottom of this section of the book." רוח in this phrase presumably represents what אויר does later in the book – just ordinary "air" over against the Spirit of God. The two

kinds of רוח are distinguished in § 12 (in reality the next paragraph in the book). But making this addition at this point, and apparently identifying the two kinds of רוח, only compounds the ambiguity rather than clarifying it.

(3) The addition of the quotation from Ps 93:2 – only in the Long Recension and then not in Ms H. Neither Dunash, Donnolo, nor Judah ben Barzillai have it in their texts of this paragraph. It is clearly secondary; see Hayman 1984: 171. Gruenwald points out that with this addition there are ten words from נכון to ועד which laid the text open to kabbalistic interpretation, identifying the names with the *sefirot*. Weinstock too sees this as one of the motives for the growth of this paragraph (1972: 45, n.3).

(4) An addition in all recensions of the liturgical expression ברוך ומבורך שמו, which is completed in different ways in the recensions, while Ms H (supported by Dunash) omits ומבורך. Note the other signs of the growth of this addition in Ms I in the Short and B^2H in the Long Recension. Donnolo does not have this particular addition at all, though he does substitute שלחי העולמים for חיים earlier in the paragraph. This leads Weinstock to relegate חיים to the status of a gloss. Donnolo on his own is insufficient evidence to support such a conclusion but his quotation does illustrate the fluid nature of this paragraph.

Overall, the additions to § 10 with their references to the Bible, to rabbinic titles for God and familiar liturgical expressions have the effect of toning down the strangeness of SY and making it look more at home in the rabbinic tradition of Judaism; see Hayman 1987: 83. We will see far more of this type of secondary material as we progress through the work. Finally, I am not persuaded by Shlomo Pines' argument (1989: 88) that the Saadyan version of §§ 10 and 12 shows signs of an earlier stage of the SY tradition which only referred to six, not ten *sefirot*. The parallels between SY and the Clementine Homilies are indeed fascinating, as was noted long ago by Grätz (1846: 102–132), but although influences similar to those which were at work in these Jewish-Christian texts may ultimately be behind the origin of SY, the text as we have it in all the Mss clearly has ten *sefirot* and only ten.

Sefer Yeṣira § 11

A

עשר ספירות בלימה אחת רוח אלהים חיים שתים רוח מרוח הקודש שלוש מים מרוח ארבע
אש ממים ורום ותחת ומזרח ומערב וצפון ודרום

The ten sefirot are the basis: one – the Spirit of the Living God; two – air from the Holy Spirit; three – water from air; four – fire from water; and above and below, east and west, north and south.

B^1B^2GH collated to A:
הקודש] om G.

Notes on the text of § 11

This paragraph is missing in all the Short Recension Mss, in the Saadyan Recension, and in Ms D in the Long Recension. It recurs in all witnesses at § 16 which seems a far more logical place for such a summary rather than wedged between paragraphs specifying the first and second *sefirot.*

Sefer Yeṣira § 12

K	A	C
שתים רוח מרוח חקק וחצב בה' עשרים ושתים אותיות יסוד שלש אמות ושבע כפולות, ושתים עשרה פשוטות. ורוח אחת מהן	שתים רוח מרוח חקק וחצב בה ארבע רוחות השמים מזרח ומערב צפון ודרום ורוח בכל אחת מהן.	שתים רוח מרוח חקק וחצב בה ארבע רוחות השמים מזרח ומערב צפון ודרום ורוח בכל אחת מהן [= ch. 4:2] שתים רוח מרוח חקקן וחצב בם ארבע רוחות השמים[1].
Two – air from Spirit: he carved and hewed in it the twenty-two basic letters – three primary letters, and seven doubles, and twelve simple (letters). And the Spirit is one of them.	Two – air from Spirit: he carved and hewed in it the four winds of heaven – east and west, north and south. And the air is in each one of them.	Two – air from Spirit: he carved and hewed in it the four winds of heaven – east and west, north and south. And the air is in each one of them. [= ch. 4:2] Two – air from Spirit: he carved them and hewed in them the four winds of heaven.
[1] S* omits from בה to וחצב in § 13 by homoio. It is partly restored in the margin.		[1] שתים[0]...השמים 2 is placed after § 20 and before § 13 in CE. It is absent in Z.
LMN(S)FPIQR collated to K: יסוד] om LP. אחת] לכל אחד L, אחד FP, לכל אחת R, בכל אחת S^{mg}.	B^1B^2GDH collated to A: מרוח] add הקדש H. בה] om B^2. בכל] עם כל B^1B^2H.	ZE collated to C (ch. 4:2): חקק] חקקן E. בם] בה E.

Notes to the text of § 12

The Long and the Short Recensions go their separate ways in this paragraph while Mss C and E have two different versions of it. Their first version appears as Saadya's chapter 4:2 between §§ 10 and 17. But they then have a second version placed between §§ 20 and 13, i.e. between Saadya's chapter 4:4 and 4:5. In this latter position the paragraph is in its logical place, as reflected in the Long and Short

Recensions – before §§ 13–16. These two Mss seem, therefore, to have preserved an earlier stage in the formation of the Saadyan Recension before § 12 was wrenched out of its original context and placed before § 17 – for reasons which, as we will see, probably generated the Short Recension version. The version which Saadyan had before him had simply eliminated what would now have appeared as an unnecessary doublet. Ms B^2 also has two versions of § 12 but placed side by side; first comes the Long Recension form (collated above), and then part of the Short Recension form.[42] Besides preserving signs of the original location of § 12 Mss C and E have probably also preserved the earliest recoverable form of the paragraph, providing more textual evidence for Gruenwald's view of the original text of §§ 10–14.[43] It is interesting to observe that in his translation of this paragraph (more a paraphrase actually), and in his comment on it, Saadya appears to be addressing himself to this shorter CE form rather than the one cited in the lemma in Ms Z. His translation goes: "for in the second stage (we have) the visible air from which blow the four winds" (Kafach 1972: 110, Lambert 1891: 73). It is possible that the Hebrew text of SY cited in Ms Z has been updated in the two hundred and thirty years since the commentary left Saadya's pen. The Ms E text with the singular forms חקק and בה makes better sense than the plurals of C and agrees with all the other witnesses and is, therefore, the nearest we can get to the original form of § 12.

The next stage in the evolution of § 12 is reflected in the Long Recension which was also the basis for the first citation of the paragraph in the Saadyan version. This spells out the four winds of heaven, emphasizing that the air or the Spirit – the ambiguity is irresolvable, is present throughout them. But note the uncertainty of the scribes about the meaning of the last four words ורוח בכל אחת מהן, both in the Long and the Short Recensions. Another variant occurs at this point in Dunash's commentary: ורוח אחת ביניהם (Vajda 1954: 41, Vajda-Fenton 2002: 224).[44]

The Short Recension represents a complete rewrite of the paragraph. It looks as though the Long Recension form of § 9 has been grafted onto the original version of § 12 replacing the phrase ארבע רוחות השמים. This reflects the same editorial urge which we can see in the creation of § 2, the position of § 9 in the Long Recensions, and the masterplan for the structure of the Saadyan Recension, namely, to integrate together the two separate parts of SY – §§ 1–16 dealing with the *sefirot*, and §§ 17–61 (63) dealing with the twenty-two letters.[45] The artificial nature of the

[42] עשרים ושתים אותיות יסוד שלש אימות ושבע כפולות ושתים עשרה פשוטות ורוח בכל אחת מהן.

[43] See also Weinstock's note to this paragraph in Allony 1981a: 23, l. 118.

[44] However, Oxford 2250 has the Short Recension reading ורוח אחת מהם (Grossberg 1902: 40). See Liebes 2000: 280 for an attempt to make sense of the variant readings at this point. However his attempt on p. 168 to use the Short Recension version of § 12 to throw light on § 20 does not take into account the versions of § 12 found in the other recensions.

[45] Cf. Gruenwald 1973: 498.

Short Recension version of § 12 is clear from the last three words ורוח אחת מהן: and the Spirit is one of them. One of what? – the twenty-two letters! The variant readings reflect the puzzlement we share with the scribes. The phrase makes sense in the context of the Long Recension – the air, created from the Spirit is in all the four winds of heaven; it does not make sense here in this reshaped version of the Short Recension. It was probably the phrase חצובות ברוח (hewn out in the air) from § 17 – referring there to the twenty-two letters, which gave rise to this Short Recension version of § 12. Saadya in his commentary on the passage connects it up with § 17 and, as we have seen, in his version and the first version in Mss CE, § 12 is immediately followed by § 17. Probably, we can see here at work one of the principles which helped to reshape the Long into the Saadyan Recension.

Sefer Yeṣira § 13

C

שליש מים מרוח חקקן וחצב בה תוהו ובוהו רפש וטיט עשאן כמן ערוגה סככן כמין מעזיבה חצבן כמן חומה ויצק מים עליהן ונעשה עפר כי לשלג יאמר זה קוו יריק שמקיף את כל העולם כולו בוהו אלו אבנים מפולמות המשוקעות בתהום ומבנים יצאו מים

Three – water from air: he carved and hewed in it *tohu* and *bohu*, mud and mire. He made them like a sort of garden-bed. He wove them like a sort of ceiling. He hewed them like a sort of wall, and he poured out water over them and it became dust, *For to the snow he says,* [*"Become earth"* (Job 37:6). *Tohu*] is a green line which surrounds the world. Bohu is the slimy stones sunk in the abyss between which the water comes out (*b. Ḥag.* 12a, *y. Ḥag* 77c).

A

שלוש מים מרוח חקק וחצב בה תוהו ובהו רפש וטיט עשאן כמין ערוגה הציבן כמין חומה וסיככן כמין מעזיבה ויצק שלג עליהן ונעשה עפר שנאמר כי לשלג יאמר הוי ארץ תוהו זה קו ירוק שמקיף את העולם בוהו אילו אבנים מפולמות המשוקעות בתהום ומביניהן המים יוצאין.

Three – water from air: he carved and hewed in it *tohu* and *bohu*, mud and mire. He made them like a sort of garden-bed. He erected them like a sort of wall, and he wove them like a sort of ceiling. And he poured out snow over them and it became dust, for it is said: *For to the snow he says, "Become earth"* (Job 37:6). Tohu is a green line which surrounds the world. *Bohu* is the slimy stones sunk in the abyss between which the water comes out (*b. Ḥag.* 12a, *y. Ḥag* 77c).

K

שלש מים מרוח חקק וחצב בהם תוהו ובוהו רפש וטיט. חקקן כמין ערוגה הציבן כמין חומה סיככן כמין מעזיבה.

Three – water from air: he carved and hewed in it *tohu* and *bohu*, mud and mire. He carved them like a sort of garden-bed. He erected them like a sort of wall, and he wove them like a sort of ceiling.

S

שלש מים מרוח חקק וחצב בהם תוהו ובוהו רפש וטיט חקקן כמין ערוגה הציבן כמין חומה וסככן כמין מעזיבה יצק מים עליהן ונעשה עפר דכתיב כי לשלג יאמר הוא ארץ תהו זה קו ירוק שמקיף את העולם כלו בהו אילו אבנים מפולמות המשוקעות בתהום ומבניהם המים יוצאים.

LMNFPIQR collated to K:
[חקקן] עשאן LP. [הציבן] חצבן I.

D

שלש מים מרוח חקק וחצב בהן ובהו ורפש וטיט עשאן כמין ערוגה. הציבן כמין חומה. סככן כמין מעזיבה ויצק מים עליהן ונעשה עפר דכתיב כי לשלג יאמר הוה ארץ. תהו זה קו ירוק בהו אלו אבנים מפולמות המשוקעות בתהום ומביניהם המים הם יוצאין.

B^1B^2GH collated to A:
[בה] om B^1. [עשאן] pr חקקן B^2. וסיככן] B^1B^2H. [שלג] מים] om B^1H. [שנאמר] om B^2.
[את העולם] כל העולם כולו B^1B^2.

Z

שלש מַיִם מרוח חקק וחצב בה תהו ובהו רפש וטיט עשאן כמין ערוגה חצבן כמין חומה סִיכְּכָן כמין מעזיבה ויצק מים עליהן ונעשה עפר שנאמר כי לשלג יאמר הוא ארץ תהו זה קו יָרוֹק שמקיף את כל העולם כולו בֹּהוּ אלו אבנים הַמְפוּלָמוֹת הַמְשׁוּקָעוֹת בתהום שמביניהם יוֹצְאִין מים שנאמר ונטה עליה קו תהו ואבני בֹּהוּ.

E collated to C:
חקק] שלש E. [שלישׁ חקק כמה pr] כי E. [סככן] סדרן E. שנאמר E.

Notes on the text of § 13

§ 13 illustrates clearly the tendency of SY to grow by the accumulation of biblical and rabbinic material.[46] The quotations from Job 37:6 and from *b. Ḥag* 12a, *y. Ḥag* 77c are attested only in the Long and Saadyan Recensions and Ms S in the Short Recension, while Saadya adds a quotation from Isa 34:11 which is the source of the baraita in the two Talmuds. The implication of Gruenwald's argument (1973: 498) is that everything after שלש מים מרוח is an addition to the original text of the paragraph. He may well be right but we have no supporting textual evidence for such a short text. Dunash and Judah ben Barzillai reflect the Short Recension form of this paragraph while Donnolo's paraphrase seems to be based on a text close to that of Saadya. In the Short Recension form of the paragraph the biblical allusions lie scarcely detectable in the background: תוהו ובוהו (Gen 1:2), רפש וטיט (Isa 57:20), ערוגה (S of S 6:2). Gruenwald (1973: 505) suggests that the motivation for the expansion of this paragraph was probably "editorial harmonization of the three-element theory of SY with the common four-element theory" and "this editorial harmonization was introduced at this stage just because water and earth are the

[46] See Hayman 1984: 183 and 1987: 83, and for more detailed treatment of § 13 1984: 172–74, 1987: 76–78.

two components of clay which is mentioned at the beginning of our paragraph." In addition, as I have argued (1984: 172–184), it looks as though the scribes mistook this paragraph as referring to the creation of the earth[47] whereas, in fact, it deals only with the creation of the boundaries of space and the heavens – on the analogy the author is working with, the walls and the ceiling, but not the floor.

בהם/בה. It looks as though the Short Recension understanding is that *tohu* and *bohu* were carved and hewn out of the waters, while the Long and Saadyan Recensions (less Ms D) have them created out of the air. See the same variant between Mss C and E in § 12. Possibly the reading בה is the result of contamination from §§ 12 and 14.

עשאן (Long and Saadyan Recensions) versus חקקן (Short Recension except for Mss LP). Weinstock (1972: 49, n.6) argues for the priority of עשאן, but I am unable to see any secure criterion for deciding between these two variants. It is the same with the variants הציבן versus חצבן.

מים. ויצק שלג/מים is an adaptation to the theme of § 13 (so Gruenwald 1973: 507) but may also be an accommodation to § 28. שלג fits the biblical text better. See Gruenwald (*ibid.*) for rabbinic material making similar use of Job 37:6.

Sefer Yeṣira § 14

K

ארבע אש ממים חקקן וחצב בה כסא הכבוד ואופנים ושרפים וחיות הקודש ומלאכי השרת ומשלשתן ייסד מעונו שנאמר עושה מלאכיו רוחות משרתיו אש לוהט.

Four – fire from water: he carved them and hewed in it the throne of glory, and the *Ofanim* and the *Serafim*, and the holy living creatures, and the ministering angels. And from the three of them he founded his abode, as it is said: *he makes his angels winds, his servants a flaming fire* (Ps.104:4).

A

ארבע אש ממים חקקן וחצב בה כסא הכבוד ואופנים ושרפים וחיות הקודש ומלאכי השרת ומשלשתן ייסד מעונו שנאמר עושה מלאכיו רוחות משרתיו אש לוהט.

Four – fire from water: he carved them and hewed in it the throne of glory, and the *Ofanim* and the *Serafim*, and the holy living creatures, and the ministering angels. And from the three of them he founded his abode, as it is said: *he makes his angels winds, his servants a flaming fire* (Ps.104:4).

C

ארבע אש מרוח חקק וחצב בה כסא כבוד וכל צבא מרום שכן כתוב עושה מלאכיו רוחות וג׳.

Four – fire from air [rd. water]: he carved and hewed in it the throne of glory, and all the heavenly host, for thus it is written: *he makes his angels winds, etc.* (Ps.104:4).

[47] And thus conforming to the Hillelite view that earth was created first whereas § 28 explicitly reflects the Shammaite position; see the famous debate in *y.Ḥag.* 77c–d, *b.Ḥag.* 12a, *Ber. R.* 1:15.

Z

ארבע אש ממים חקק וחצב
בה כסא כבוד וכל צבא מרום
שכך כתוב עשֶׂה מלאכיו
רוחות משרתיו אש לוהט

LMNSFPIQR collated to K:
ממים] מרוח F. חקק] חקקן L...R.
בה] בהן MQ. ושרפים] om I.
שנאמר] om F, דכת׳ S.

B^1B^2GH collated to A:
וחצב] om B^2. שנאמר] דכת׳ D.

E collated to Z:
ממים] om E. צבאי] צבא E.
משרתיו אש לוהט] om E.

Notes on the text of § 14

The textual situation here is similar to that in §§ 12 and 13: one recension has a short form of the paragraph which is considerably expanded in the other recensions. As with § 12, and in contrast to § 13, it is the Saadyan Recension (and specifically Mss CE) which offers the shortest text. מרוח in C is clearly an error; see the same error in Ms F.[48] The difference between CE and Z on the length of the biblical quotation is only apparent; as with so many biblical quotations in rabbinic texts the partial citation was meant to call up the whole of the text in the mind of the reader – hence the וג׳ in C.

In the Short and Long Recensions וכל צבא מרום is replaced by a fuller description of what this term refers to. This specification of the four classes of angels is taken from *b. Ḥag.* 12b; see Hayman 1987:74–75. It is of a piece with the baraita from the same source by which § 13 was expanded in the Long and Saadyan Recensions.

חקק] חקקן L...R. Clearly the Short Recension reading is חקק in line with the Saadyan Recension. Cf. the apparatus to the Saadyan Recension in §§ 12 and 13 and the note on בה/בהם in § 13.

ומשלשתן ייסד מעונו. From the three of what? – presumably the air, water, and fire of §§ 12–14.[49] As Gruenwald 1973: 499 points out, the phrase recurs in § 57 (which is not attested in the Short Recension) but there it refers to the three groups of the letters of the alphabet. Gruenwald sees here yet another sign of the "textual incongruity between the two parts of the book," reflecting his view that ultimately they go back to different authors. However, if neither the Short and Long Recension

[48] See the notes on Ms F in the Introduction § 8.3. Liebes (2000: 26, n.17) is inclined to see this as a deliberate attempt to harmonize with the Aristotelian ordering of the elements. But that scheme would really require a reading רוח מאש. It is simpler to see the reading אש מרוח as produced by erroneous comparison with the beginning of the two previous paragraphs – רוח מרוח and מים מרוח.

[49] Donnolo (Castelli 40) adds מרוח וממים ומאש after מעונו.

texts of § 14 nor the whole text of § 57 belong to the earliest layer of material in the book, then the incongruity was created at one of the later editorial stages, possibly by different editors. It probably did not exist in the earlier form of the text.

It is possible to speculate that even the Saadyan form of the text of § 14 represents an expansion of the original. We have seen that Gruenwald thinks that only the names of the *sefirot* were in the original text. I have previously drawn attention to the fact that hardly any of the biblical citations now found in the various texts of SY are attested in all the witnesses (Hayman 1984). In fact, only Ezek 1:14 and Ps 104:4 appear in all our Mss. This might predispose us to think that even these two quotations should be regarded as secondary. However, in the light of the absence of textual support for this I am reluctant to leap to such a conclusion, especially since the quotation from Ps 104 is particularly apposite to the point being made in § 14.

Sefer Yeṣira § 15

C

חמ[ש] ברר שלש פשוטות וק[ב]ען בשמו הגדול הוי וחתם בהן שש קצוות חתם רום פנה למעלה וחתמו ביהו. שבע חתם מזרח פנה לפניו וחתמו בהוי. שמנה חתם מערב פנה לאחריו וחתמו בהיו. תשע חתם דרום פנה לימינו וחתמו בהוי. עשר חתם צפו[ן] פנה לשמאלו וחתמו ביוה.

Five – He chose three simple letters and fixed them in his great name – HWY. And he sealed with them the six edges (of the universe). He sealed above. He turned upwards and sealed it with YHW. [Six – he sealed below. He turned downwards and sealed it with YWH]. Seven – he sealed the east. He turned in front and sealed it with HWY. Eight – he sealed the west. He turned behind and sealed it with HYW. Nine – he sealed the

A

חמש חתם רום בירר שלוש פשוטות וקבען בשמו הגדול יוד הי ויו וחתם בהן שש קצוות ופנה למעלה וחיתמו ביהו.שש חתם תחת ניפנה למטה וחיתמו ביוה. שבע חתם מזרח ניפנה לפניו וחיתמו בהיו. שמינית חתם מערב ניפנה לאחריו וחיתמו בהוי. תשיעית חתם דרום ניפנה לימינו וחיתמו בויה. עשר חתם צפון נפנה לשמאלו וחיתמו בוהי.

Five – he sealed above. He chose three simple letters and fixed them in his great name – YHW. And he sealed with them the six edges (of the universe), and turned upwards and sealed it with YHW. Six – he sealed below. He turned downwards and sealed it with YWH. Seven – he sealed the east. He turned in front and sealed it with HYW. Eight – he sealed the west. He turned-behind and sealed it with

K

חמש חתם רום ברר שלש פשוטות וקבען בשמו הגדול וחתם בהם שש קצוות ופנה למעלה וחתמו שש חתם תחת ופנה למטה וחתמו שבע חתם מזרח ופנה למטה וחתמו שמנה חתם מערב ופנה לאחריו וחתמו תשע חתם דרום ופנה לימינו וחתמו עשר חתם צפון ופנה לשמאלו וחתמו

Five – he sealed above. He chose three simple letters and fixed them in his great name. And he sealed with them the six edges (of the universe), and he turned upwards and sealed it. Six – he sealed below, and he turned downwards and sealed it. Seven – he sealed the east, and he turned downwards [rd. in front] and sealed it. Eight – he sealed the west, and he turned behind and sealed it. Nine – he sealed the south, and he turned to

his right and sealed it. Ten – he sealed the north, and he turned to his left and sealed it.

HWY. Nine – he sealed the south. He turned to his right and sealed it with WYH. Ten – he sealed the north. He turned to his left and sealed it with WHY.

south. He turned to his right and sealed it with HWY. Ten – he sealed the north. He turned to his left and sealed it with YWH.

P

חמש חתם רום בירר שלש אותיות מן הפשוטות וקבען בשמו הגדול יהו וחתם בהן שש קצוות ופנה למעלה וחתמו ביהו. שש חתם תחת ופנה למטה וחתמו ביוה. שבע חתם מזרח ופנה לפניו וחתמו בהוי. שמנה חתם מערב ופ נה לאחריו וחתמו בהיו. תשע חתם דרום ופנה לימינו וחתמו בויה. עשר חתם צפון ופנה לשמאלו וחתמו בוהי.

LMNSFIQR collated to P:
חמש [חמש...פשוטות שלש אותיות מן הפשוטות MN. חתם ברום בעד שלש אותיות SIQ. ביוד [ברר SQ. אמות [מן הפשוטות FI. י״ב פשוטות [הפשוטות

D

חמש חתם רום ביוד שלש אמות וקבען בשמו הגדול יהו וחתם בהם שש קצוות. פנה למעלה וחתם ביהו. שש חתם תחת ופנה למטה וחתמו ביהו ולא ביוה שבע חתם מזרח ופנה לפניו וחתמו בהוי. שמנה חתם מערב ופנין לאחריו וחתמו בהיו. תשע חתם דרום ופנה לימינו וחתמו בויה. עשר חתם צפון [fol.227b] ופנה לשמאלו וחתמו בויה.

B¹B²GH collated to A:
ביוד [ברור om B². וקבען בשמו H. בידו, B¹B², וקבעו בשמו [הגדול B¹.

Z

ברר שלש פשוטות וקבען בשמו הגדול וחתם בהן שש קצוות חתם רום פנה למעלה וחתמו ביהו שש חתם תחת פנה למטה וחתמו ביוה. שבע חתם מזרח פנה לפניו וחתמו בהוי. שמנה חתם מערב פנה לפניו וחתמו בהיו תשע חתם דרום פנה לימינו וחתמו בויה. עשר חתם צפון פנה לשמאלו וחתמו בוהי.

E collated to Z:
[לפניו E. הוי add [הגדול לאחריו E.

Notes on the text of § 15

Although the three recensions witness to approximately the same text of this paragraph there is some disturbance at the beginning which suggests that an earlier form has undergone expansion. I suspect that the earlier form of the text had חמש חתם רום פנה למעלה ... on the pattern of the rest of the paragraph and that בירר שלוש פשוטות וקבען בשמו הגדול יוד הי ויו וחתם בהן שש קצוות is a later insertion. In the Long and Short Recensions it has separated חתם רום from פנה למעלה. In the Saadyan Recension it was inserted between חמש and חתם רום. The text of this insertion is not stable unlike the rest of the paragraph: all Short Recension Mss except K read like Ms P שלש אותיות מן הפשוטות instead of simply שלוש פשוטות, while Mss MN begin the paragraph: חמש שלש אותיות מן הפשוטות חתם ברום בעד שלש וקבען בשמו הגדול יהו.[50] The expansion builds in links to the second part of

[50] Donnolo (Castelli 42) begins the paragraph with an even longer insertion before resuming חתם רום.

the book – more strongly in the form of the expansion in most Short Recension Mss; the variants אמות (SQ) and י״ב פשוטות take us further along this trajectory (cf. §§ 24, 45). Apart from this insertion in § 15 there is no securely attested reference in the first part of the book (§§ 1–16) to the threefold division of the letters of the alphabet. שש קצוות comes in from the textual tradition of § 38; in the first part of the book the dimensions of space are denoted by the term עומק (§ 7). Gruenwald similarly sees textual disturbance in the beginning of this paragraph but his restoration simply rearranges the existing material: בירר שלוש פשוטות ... וחתם בהן שש קצוות. – חתם רום ופנה למעלה (1973: 510).

Another variant of this insertion can be seen in Mss B^1B^2(H) in the Long Recension and SIQ in the Short – ביוד instead of בירר. This reading also occurs in Paris 763 and Dunash according to Vajda-Fenton 2002: 80. B^1's readings would result in the following translation: "Five – he sealed above with Yod– three simple letters, and fixed it in his name YHW."

There is an extensive omission by parablepsis in MS C (שש חתם תחת פנה למטה וחתמו ביוה) while Z repeats לפניו; the correct reading לאחריו is in C and E.

ניפנה in Ms A. Most Long Recension manuscripts keep to פנה in line with the other recensions.

ביהו etc. The order of the combinations of the letters of the divine name varies in the manuscripts and there are naturally errors and duplications which are not worth recording. Ms K alone takes out these permutations of the divine name which is why, on this occasion, it cannot serve as the base manuscript for the Short Recension. Presumably its scribe felt that this was esoteric material best concealed from the masses. On the other hand, is it conceivable that they were added in an ancestor of all the other Mss at the same time as the long insertion before or after חתם רום?

Sefer Yeṣira § 16

K	A	C
אילו עשר ספירות בלימה רוח אלהים חיים, ורוח מים אש. מעלה מטה, מזרח מערב, צפון ודרום.	אילו עשר ספירות בלימה: אחת רוח אלהים חיים. שתים רוח מרוח. שלוש מים מרוח. ארבע אש ממים ורום מעלה ותחת מזרח ומערב צפון ודרום.חסלת.	עשר ספירות בלי[מ]ה אחת רוח אלהים חיים שתים רוח מרוח שליש מים מרוח ארבע אש ממים רום ממים ותחת מזרח ומערב צפון ודרום
These ten *sefirot* are the basis: the Spirit of the Living God; and air, water, fire; above, below, east, west, north and south.	These ten *sefirot* are the basis: one – the Spirit of the Living God; two – air from the Spirit; three – water from air; four – fire from water; and the height above and below, east and west, north and south.	These ten *sefirot* are the basis: one – the Spirit of the Living God; two – air from the Spirit; three – water from air; four – fire from water; above from water and below, east and west, north and south.

S	D	Z
אילו עשר ספירות בלימה אחת רוח אלהים חיים שתים רוח מרוח שלש מים מרוח ארבע אש ממים ורום ומטה. מזרח מערב צפון דרום.	אלו עשר ספירות בלי מה. אחת רוח אלהים חיים. שתים מרוח לרוח. שלוש מים מרוח. ארבע אש ממים ורום מעלה ומטה מזרח ומערב צפון ודרום.	אלו עשר ספירות בלימה אחת רוח אלהים חיים שתים רוח מרוח שלש אש מרוח ארבע אש ממים רום ותחת מזרח ומערב צפון ודרום.
LMNFPIQR collated to K: רוח] om F. חיים] om LP. מעלה] רום LMNP, pr ורום Q. מטה] תחת LMNFPQ.	B^1B^2GH collated to A: עשר] om B^1. מעלה] om G.	E collated to Z: מים 1^0] אש E.

Notes on the text of § 16

On the general position of this paragraph in the text of SY see the notes on § 11. Again it seems that a shorter text preserved in the Short Recension (apart from Ms S) has been expanded in the other Recensions. The expansions were simple – inserting the numerals and the phrases מרוח and ממים from §§ 12–14. מעלה for רום in some Mss departs from the term hitherto used for this *sefirah* in §§ 7 and 15. This produces the composite reading רום מעלה in the Long Recension (apart from G – but note G's reading in § 7) and Mss SQ. אש מרוח in Ms Z certainly looks an error though it is what C (but not Z!) has in § 14. ממים 2^0 in C is clearly a duplication from the previous phrase אש ממים.

Sefer Yeṣira § 17

K	A	C
(17a) עשרים ושתים אותיות חקוקות בקול, חצובות ברוח, קבועות בפה בחמש מקומות. אח הע בו מף גז כק דט לנת זס שרץ	(17a) עשרים ושתים אותיות יסוד שלוש אימות ושבע כפולות ושתים עשרה פשוטות חקוקות בקול חצובות ברוח קבועות בפה בחמשה מקומות.(17b) אח הע בומף גיכק דטלנת זסצרש קשורות בראש הלשון כשלהבת בגחלת אה חע משתמשות בסוף הלשון ובבית הבליעה בומף [fol.67a] משתמשות בין שפתים ובראש הלשון. גיכק על שליש הלשון נכרתות. דטלנת בראש הלשון משתמשות עם הקול. זסצרש בין שיניים ובלשון ישן.	(17a) עשרים ושתים אותיות יסוד שלוש אומות שבע כפולות ושתים עשרה פשוטות אותיות חצובות [ב]רוח חקוקות בקול קבועות בפה בחמשה מקומות אה הע בו מף גיכט דט לנת לנת בראש הלשון כשלהבת בגחלת (17b) אה הע משתמשות בסוף הלשון ובית הבליעה בו מף משתמשות בן שפתים ובראש הלשון גי כט על שליש הלשון נכרתת דט לנת בראש הלשון ובחיך ומשתמשות עם הקול זס תרש בן שנים ובלשון ישן.

(17a) The twenty-two letters: they are hewn out in the air, carved out by the voice, fixed in the mouth in five positions: Aleph, Ḥet; He, Ayin; Bet, Waw; Mem, Pe; Gimel, Zayin; Kaph, Qof; Dalet, Tet; Lamed, Nun, Taw; Zayin, Samek; Shin, Resh, Sade.

(17a) The twenty-two letters are the foundation: three primary letters, seven double (letters), and twelve simple (letters). They are carved out by the voice, hewn out in the air, fixed in the mouth in five positions: Aleph, Ḥet; He, Ayin; Bet, Waw, Mem, Pe; Gimel, Yod, Kaph, Qof; Dalet, Tet, Lamed, Nun, Taw; Zayin, Samek, Sade, Resh, Shin. (17b) They are bound to the tip of the tongue as the flame to the burning coal. Aleph, He, Ḥet, Ayin are pronounced at the back of the tongue and in the throat. Bet, Waw, Mem, Pe are pronounced between the teeth and by the tip of the tongue. Gimel, Yod, Kaph, Qof are cut off a third of the way up the tongue. Dalet, Tet, Lamed, Nun, Taw are pronounced by the tip of the tongue with the voice. Zayin, Samech, Sade, Resh, Shin (are pronounced) between the teeth with the tongue relaxed.

(17a) The twenty-two letters are the foundation: three primary letters, seven double (letters), and twelve simple (letters). They are hewn out in the air, carved out by the voice, fixed in the mouth in five positions: Aleph, He; He, Ayin; Bet, Waw; Mem, Pe; Gimel, Yod, Kaph, Tet; Dalet, Tet; Lamed, Nun, Taw; Lamed, Nun, Taw. . . (17b) to the tip of the tongue as the flame to the burning coal. Aleph, He, He, Ayin are pronounced at the back of the tongue and in the throat. Bet, Waw, Mem, Pe are pronounced between the teeth and by the tip of the tongue. Gimel, Yod, Kaph, Tet are cut off a third of the way up the tongue. Dalet, Samek, Lamed, Nun, Taw by the tip of the tongue and with the palate, and they are pronounced with the voice. Zayin, Samech, Taw, Resh, Shin (are pronounced) between the teeth with the tongue relaxed.

S

עשרים ושתים אותיות
יסוד חקוקות בקול חצובות
ברוח קבועות בפה בחמשה
מקומות אח הע בו מף גז כק
דט לנת זס שרץ. קשורות
בלשון כשלהבת בגחלת.
אחהע משתמשות בסוף
הלשון ובבית הבליעה. בומף
משתמשות בין השפתים
ובראש הלשון. גיכק
משתמשות בשליש הלשון.
דטלנת משתמשות בראש
הלשון. זסשרץ משתמשות בין
השפתים ובלשון ישן.

D

עשרים ושתים אותיות יסוד
שלוש אמות ושבע כפולות
ושתים עשרה פשוטות.
חקוקות בקול חצובות
ברוח קבועות בפה בחמשה
מקומות אח הע בו מפ גיכק
דט לנת זס שרץ קשורות
בלשון כשלהבת בגחלת.
אה חע משתמשות בסוף
הלשון ובבית הבליעה. בו
מף משתמשות בין השפתים
ובראש הלשון. גיכק
משתמשות בשליש הלשון.
דט לנת משתמשות בראש
הלשון. זס צרש משתמשות
בין השנים ובלשון ישן.

Z

עשרים ושתים אותיות יְסוֹד
שלש אוּמוֹת שבע כְּפוּלוֹת
ושתים עשרה פְּשׁוּטוֹת אוֹתיוֹת
חצובות ברוח חקוקות בקול
קבועות בפה בחמשה מקומות
אהחע בומף גיכק דטלנת
זסצרש. אהחע משתמשות
בסוף הלשון ובית הבליעה.
בומף בין שפתים ובראש
הלשון. גיכק על שלש הַלָּשׁוֹן
נִכְרָתוֹת דטלנת על חצי הלשון
משתמשות עם הקול. זסצרש
בין שנים ובלשון יָשֵׁן.

R¹

חקוקות בקול חצובות ברוח
קבועות בפה בחמש מקומות
אחהע בומף גזכק דט לנת זס
שרץ. קשורות בראש הלשון
כשלהבת בגחלת.

E

עשרים ושתים אותיות יסוד
שלש אמות שבע כפולות
ושתים עשרה פשוטות אותיות
חקוקות בקול חצובות ברוח
קבועות בפה בחמשה
מקומות: אח הע בו מף גיכק
דט לנת זסשרץ קשורות
בראש הלשון כשלהבת
בגחלת. אח הע משתמשות
בסוף הלשון.בומף משתמשות
בין שפתים ובראש הלשון.
גיכק על שלש הלשון נכרתות.
דט לנת בראש הלשון ובחך
ומשתמשות עם הקול. זס שרץ
בין שנים ובלשון ישן.

LMNFPIQR² collated to K (Ms R repeats § 17 after § 19a = R²):

אותיות] add יסוד MNFI.

B¹B²GH collated to A:

כולן [חקוקות בקול חצובות
בין שפתים G. חקוקות]
בשפתים B². ..נכרתות]
על שלישיתיה על לשון של
שכובה [ישן G. גבר תת
ושטוחה] B¹GH.

Notes on the text of § 17

For the placing of § 9 before this in the Short Recension see the notes to § 9. The initial sentence of § 17 in the Long and Saadyan Recensions is similarly just a version of § 9, now placed in its logical position. As we have seen it is basically a heading designed to introduce the second part of the book. In the Saadyan Recension § 17 comes before the block of material which we have just been considering (§§ 12–16) and is then followed by §§ 19 and 20. The paragraph order in the Short Recension, having been stable since § 10 is now considerably disturbed. After § 16 the order in Mss K and R is 9, 19a, 17, in Ms L 9, 26, 17, in Mss MNIQ 9, 23, 17, in Mss SP 9, 17, 18, in Ms F 9, 23, 26, 19a, 17. Ms R has two versions of § 17, one after § 9 and before § 19a (= R¹), and one after it (= R²). Apart from Ms R, § 18 follows in all the Mss. In MNFIQ § 23 is then repeated in its logical position after § 22. §§ 23 and 26 seem to have been attracted to this context because of the mention of the "three mothers" in § 9 but there may be more to the dislocation of the paragraph order at this point.

This paragraph presents one of the more notable places in the textual tradition of SY where the Long and Saadyan Recensions offer a much more extended text

than the Short Recension. The explanation of where in the mouth the five different groups of letters are pronounced is completely absent in the Short Recension Mss except for Ms S which, as we have already seen, is characterised by attempts to integrate Long Recension material into the Short Recension. For the sheer textual chaos at this point in Dunash's commentary see Vajda-Fenton 2002: 84–89. However, the Hebrew text presupposed by his commentary seems to be that of the Short Recension. Judah ben Barzillai also has the Short Recension (Halberstam 1885: 208) but followed by an interpretation of the five groups of letters which bears little relation to that found in the Long and Saadyan Recensions. Donnolo (Castelli 1880: 43) more or less follows the Long Recension but with some interesting omissions.

Solving the problem of the text of SY § 17 is crucial for dealing with the issue of the date of the work. The closest parallel to the theory of phonetics expressed here in paragraph 17b is found in an Arabic treatise *Kit'ab Al-Ayin* produced by the Muslim scientist and linguist Al-Halil (c. 710 – 775/91). He too organises the letters by the place of articulation in the mouth and he also knows of the permutation of letters up to a five-letter word (cf. SY § 40). Al-Halil's book was known and used by medieval Jewish linguists, though Saadya does not seem to have known it. The parallels between SY and Al-Halil's book are discussed by Allony (1972:88–91). He argues that, though they both draw independently upon an Indian linguistic tradition, SY must be given a late date on the basis of its linguistic knowledge which he says only became available to Jewish scholars after the Muslim conquest. In a later paper (1981b) Allony revises this judgement and now sees the source of SY's linguistic knowledge definitely coming from Arab sources, so SY must postdate the Islamic enlightenment. He dates it somewhere in the second half of the eighth century. A similar argument is presented by Steven Wasserstrom (1993: 14). One could quibble with the details of Allony's argument here – for example, Al-Halil divides the consonants into 8 groups, not 5 as in SY, and he has a more logical ordering of them from the throat to the lips. However, the overall argument does seem quite convincing. Until that is, we look at the text critical evidence for SY § 17.[51] Does the detailed linguistic information belong to the earliest recoverable stage of the text or has it been added later in the post-Islamic period as a form of explanatory commentary?

The issue becomes: has the Short Recension preserved the earlier form of SY or the Long/Saadyan Recension? It may help to orientate ourselves to an answer to this question if we look at one British Library Ms (Or. 6577, Cat. Margol. 736.5) which, for reasons explained above,[52] I decided not to include in the apparatus.

[51] In his review of Allony's 1972 article Nicolas Séd (1973: 522–528) prints a French translation of the three recensions of § 17 in parallel columns but unfortunately draws no text-critical conclusions from the differences between them. Likewise Epstein, in his discussion of the phonetics of SY could have helped his case for preserving an early date for SY if he had paid attention to the text-critical situation instead of basing his discussion on the Long Recension alone – "Recherches sur le Sèfer Yeçira", *REJ* 28 (1894), 97–103.

[52] See the introduction § 8.3.

However, it offers an interesting sidelight on how SY § 17 could have grown. Folios 40a–43b of this manuscript contain the Short Recension text of SY and the text of § 17 on fol. 41a agrees with that of Ms K except that it omits בפה. Immediately after the end of § 64 there follows on fols. 43b–52a a short commentary on SY. On fol. 44b § 17 is again quoted, this time following exactly the text of Ms K, then we have § 18, followed by:

אלו מקומות של פה הקבועות עשרים ושתים אותיות בהן: אה חע משתמשות בסוף הלשון. גיכק משתמשות בשליש הלשון. דטלנת משתמשות בראש הלשון. בומף משתמשות בין שפתים ובראש הלשון. זסצרש משתמשות בין השיניים ובלשון שכובה (?).[53]

What is interesting about this Ms is the way in which § 17b is separated from § 17a and then clearly labelled as commentary. Then the commentary itself is generally shorter and less precise than that which appears in our Long and Saadyan Recension Mss. It lacks the phrase קשורות בראש הלשון כשלהבת בגחלת which in these Recensions connects together § 17a and § 17b. But note that Ms Z also lacks this phrase. And this is where the text of Ms R[1] becomes interesting because it has the text of Ms K and all the other Short Recension Mss but plus this phrase. It looks like we have here the first stage in the growth of § 17b. The phrase has been taken from § 6. The next stage would be that represented by Ms S which incorporates into § 17 a lot, but not all, of the material which appears in the Long Recension. Ms Paris 763 also seems to go back to this first stage of expansion prior to S. It is a Short Recension Ms but here after § 17a it has a form of 17b:

אהה ע: אותיות הגרון קשורות בראש הלשון כשלהבת.
בומף: משתמשות בין שפתים ובראש הלשון.
גיכק: על שליש הלשון ברוח.
דטלנת: על חצי הלשון עם הקול משתמשות.
זסצרש: בין שיניים והלשון .

Again we have an expansion of § 17 which seems to draw on, but is not identical with, the fuller version seen in the Long Recension. Judah ben Barzillai's expansion of § 17a in his commentary seems to reflect the same degree of scribal independence though to a greater extent than Ms S, BL Or. 6577 or Paris 763. Saadya's translation into Arabic of the Hebrew text on which he is commenting seems to reveal the same degree of license, for he does not offer a straight literal translation but what looks like an "improved" version. And then he feels the need to justify his translation of ובלשון ישן as "with the tongue quiescent" and to add a "special supplement" about דטלנת – "they have a distinguishing feature which is that they touch the teeth from their inside to their upper part" (Lambert 74, Kafach 110). If we now look in more detail at the individual clauses of § 17b we can see more of this fluidity in its text:

[53] This last word is difficult to read.

אה חע משתמשות בסוף הלשון ובבית הבליעה. Ms E, BL Or. 6577, Paris 763 omit the last phrase ובבית הבליעה.

בומף משתמשות בין שפתים ובראש הלשון. Donnolo omits ובראש הלשון.

גיכק על שליש הלשון נכרתות. נכרתות is missing in Mss DS, BL Or. 6577, and Paris 763 reads ברוח in this place. Note the strange reading here in Ms G.

דטלנת בראש הלשון משתמשות עם הקול. עם הקול is omitted by Donnolo and Mss DS. Mss CE supplement with ובחיך, while Saadya has על חצי הלשון for בראש הלשון.

זסצרש בין שיניים ובלשון ישן. ישן is omitted in Paris 763. B[1]GH replace it with שכובה ושטוחה – BL Or. 6577 may have שכובה. This reading could be reflecting the expansion and explanation offered in Saadya's commentary.

From this textual evidence it might be possible to reconstruct an earlier shorter form of § 17b which takes us on a smooth trajectory from § 17a to the more detailed explanations of the Long and Saadyan Recensions and then on to the commentaries. However, the fluidity of this part of § 17 would probably make the result too conjectural.

There would, then, seem to be a strong case for regarding § 17b as a supplement to § 17a with both scribes and commentators feeling some freedom to update or rewrite the material according their own linguistic knowledge and understanding. But the question is now worth raising as to whether even § 17a belongs to the earliest recoverable stage of the text of SY. The signs of textual disturbance here are the following: the attempt to combine the beginning of the paragraph with a shorter or longer version of § 9; the reversal of the phrases חקוקות בקול/ חצובות ברוח in the Saadyan Recension, and the signs of textual disturbance in the paragraph order of most Short Recension Mss – possibly as § 17 was inserted in different places. Finally, we could add that the content of § 17 is at variance both with itself and the rest of the book. For what part does a fivefold division of the letters of the alphabet play in the rest of SY? – none whatsoever! In fact, the opening part of the paragraph (in its Long Recension form) with its threefold division of the three mothers, seven doubles and twelve simple letters (integral to the structure of SY) conflicts with the fivefold division which follows. This threefold division is chosen on the basis of far more simplistic linguistic theories than that found in the longer version of § 17. The threefold division certainly lies at the base of the SY tradition and governs the structure of the work. Particularly for this latter reason Gruenwald,[54] Scholem[55] and Weinstock[56] all regard § 17 as a later accretion to the book. I conclude that § 17a belongs to the same point in the expansion of the book as stage three of § 12. Both

[54] "Paragraph 17 seems to be an independent unit: it discusses the fivefold division of the twenty-two letters of the alphabet in phonetic terms. This division is nowhere repeated in the book, and it has no bearing on its doctrines" (1973: 476, n. 2).

[55] "This is the first instance in which this division appears in the history of Hebrew linguistics and it may not have been included in the first version of the book" (1971: 784).

[56] See the editor's note which he places at the end of Allony 1981b: 50.

of these fill the gap in the earlier form of the work which omitted to specify exactly how the twenty-two letters were created. § 17 is a further development of § 19a to which, as we have seen, it is closely related in many Mss. If we take this view of the relatively late date of § 17 in the development of the SY tradition, then there is no need to invoke early Indian/Sanskrit influence (as does Liebes 2000: 236–37) in order to counteract a post-Islamic dating of SY.

The text of the Genizah Scroll (Ms C) is in a poor state in this paragraph. In particular the scribe dropped the phrase זסשרץ קשורות by parablepis – his eye leapt from the Taw at the end of לנת to the one at the end of קשורות. There are other duplications and errors –as there are also in some other Mss; scribes found this paragraph difficult to copy. The Saadyan Recension is much better preserved in Mss Z and E.

Sefer Yeṣira § 18

K

עשרים ושתים אותיות יסודם קבוע בתלי, בגלגל במאתים ועשרים ואחד עשרים. חזר גלגל פנים ואחור. וזה סימן אם לטובה למעלה מענג ואם לרעה למטה מנגע.

The twenty-two letters are their foundation. It is fixed on the Hook, on a wheel with two hundred and twenty-one gates. The wheel rotates backwards and forwards. And this is the sign: if for good, above pleasure, and if for evil, below pain.

A

עשרים ושתים אותיות יסוד קבועות בגלגל במאתים ועשרים ואחד שערים חוזר הגלגל פנים ואחור וזה סימן לדבר אם לטובה למעלה מנגע[1] ואם לרעה למטה מנגע

The twenty-two letters are the foundation. They are fixed on a wheel with two hundred and twenty-one gates. The wheel rotates backwards and forwards. And this is the sign of the matter: if for good,[57] above pleasure, and if for evil, below pain.

[1] נא׳ מענג A[mg].

C

עשרים ושתים אותיות קבועות בגלגל חזר גלגל פנים ואחור סימן לדבר אין בטובה למעלה מעונג ואם ברעה למטה בעוגע

The twenty-two letters. They are fixed on a wheel. The wheel rotates backwards and forwards. A sign for the matter: if in good, above pleasure, and if in evil, below pain.[58]

F

עשרים ושתים אותיות יסוד קבועות בגלגל במאתים ושלשים ואחד שערים. חוזר הגלגל פנים ואחור. וזהו סימן לדבר אין בטובה למעלה מענג ואין ברעה למטה מנגע.

D

עשרים ושתים אותיות יסוד קבועות בגלגל במאתים ושלשים ואחד שערים חזר גלגל פנים ואחור אם בטובה למעלה מענג ואם ברעה למטה מנגע זהו סימן לדבר

Z

שבהן חקק יה יוי צבאות אלהי ישראל אלהים חיים אל שדי רם ונשא שוכן עד וקדוש שמו (=56a)
עשרים ושתים אותיות קבועות בגלגל חזר גלגל פנים

[57] Following the marginal correction.
[58] Correction to מנגע with Mss Z and E.

ואחור חוזר גלגל פנים ואחור
סימן לדבר אין בטובה למעלה
מֵעניֵג ואין ברעה למעלה
מנֶגַע.

E

עשרים ושתים אותיות
קבועות בגלגל חזר גלגל
פנים לאחור וסימן לדבר אין
בטובה למעלה מעונג ואין
ברעה למעלה מנגע.

B²

עשרים ושתים אותיות יסוד
קבועות בגלגל במאתים
ועשרים ואחד שערים חוזר
הגלגל פנים ואחור. וזה סימן
לדבר: אם טובה למעלה
מעונג, ואם לרעה למטה
מנגע.

H

עשרים ושתים אותיות יסוד
קבועות בגלגל במאתים
ועשרים ואחד שערים חוזר
הגלגל פנים ואחור וזה סימן
לדבר אם בטובה אין למעלה
מענג ואם לרעה אין למטה
מנגע.

§ 18 is missing in Mss B¹G.

LMNSPIQR collated to F: יסוד] om I, יסודן MR, יסודות NQ. קבועות] add בתלי וזהו סימן R.] om L. לדבר] om LR. מנגע...אין] אם בטובה למעלה מעונג אם,L ואם ברעה למטה מנגע לטובה אין למעלה מעונג ואם לרעה אין למטה מנגע MNQ, אין לטובה למעלה מעונג ואין לרעה למטה מנגע S.

Notes on the text of § 18

The position of § 18 is firmly fixed in the Long Recension between §§ 17 and 19 – except that it is missing in Mss B¹G. Since all three paragraphs begin with the same phrase, parablepsis is most probably the reason for this omission. The paragraph has the same position in the Short Recension except, as we shall see later, some Mss split § 19 into two parts, one of which precedes §§ 17 and 18 and one of which follows them. In the Saadyan Recension § 19 follows on after § 17 (Saadya's ch. 4:3–4) while § 18 is placed in an entirely different setting – wedged between §§ 47 and 58b (Saadya's ch. 2:5–6). The manuscript of Saadya's commentary (Z) splits up § 56 into two parts and inserts § 56a here before § 18 and again before § 58. It is clearly intrusive here as Mss C and E show.

The shortest text of this paragraph is in Mss C and E. However, once we have stripped out from Z the intrusive § 56a and the doublet חוזר גלגל פנים ואחור it can be seen to be attesting the same text form. The other recensions seem to have imported the 221/231 gates from § 19 though, as we shall see, there is some doubt even there over their place in the earliest recoverable text of SY. The scribes seem to have had real difficulty in understanding the second half of § 18 and virtually every scribe has attempted to clarify the text with the result – more confusion!

יסוד. See on § 2 for this ubiquitous variant.

בתלי in Mss K and R is imported from §§ 55/59 and is out of place here.

במאתים ושלשים ואחד/במאתים ועשרים ואחד. In § 19 Saadya found במאתים ועשרים ואחד in the Hebrew text before him but corrected it to במאתים ושלשים ואחד as an obvious error.[59] Allony's solution to this problem (1972: 81) has much to commend it: in an early Ms the upper stroke of the abbreviation רל'א was faint and a scribe misread it as רכ'א and the error was then passed down the line – mainly in the Long and Saadyan Recension Mss. The same error occurs in the Mss of § 19. The correct formula for the permutations is n(n-1) ÷ 2 which with n=22 gives 231.[60]

It is very difficult to work out what has caused the textual confusion at the end of this paragraph – except for scribal attempts to rectify or improve the text. Most of the readings make some kind of sense. The repeated נגע in Ms A is clearly an error, as the marginal corrector saw. Similarly בעוגע in C is an error typical of this poorly written Ms. Our two earliest Mss (A and C) already exhibit the major variants (אין or אם and למעלה 2° versus למטה). Ms H and MNQS show scribes trying to solve the problem by putting in all the variants they know of. What the author originally wrote has disappeared from sight though the general point he wished to make is not difficult to discern.

Sefer Yeṣira § 19

C	A	K
עשרים ושתים אותיות יסוד שלוש אומות חקקן חצבן צרפן שקלן והימירן כאיזה צד צרפן אלף עם כולן וכולן עם אלף בית עם כולן וכולן עם בית גימל עם כולן וכולן עם גימל וכולן חוזרות חלילה. נמצאו יוצאות במאתים ועשרים ואחד שערים נמצא כל היצור וכל הדיבור יוצא בשם אחד.	עשרים ושתים אותיות חקקן חצבן שקלן והמירן וצרפן וצר בהן נפש כל היצור ונפש כל העתיד לצור כאי צד שקלן והמירן אלף עם כולן וכולן עם אלף בית עם כולן וכולן עם בית גימל עם כולן וכולן עם גימל וכולן חוזרות חלילה נמצאו יוצאות במאתים ועשרים ואחד שערים נמצא כל היצור וכל הדיבור יוצא בשם אחד.	(19a) עשרים ושתים אותיות חקקן, חצבן, שקלן, המרן, צרפן וצר בהם נפש כל היצור ונפש כל העתיד לצור. (19b) כאיזה צד שקלן והמרן אלף עם כולן וכולן עם אלף בית ועם כולם וכולם עם בית וחוזרות חלילה נמצא בית במאתים ועשרים ואחד עשרים שמהם נברא הכל. נמצא כל הדיבור וכל היצור יוצא בשם אחד.
Twenty-two letters are the foundation: three primary letters ... He carved them out, he hewed them, he combined	Twenty-two letters: he carved them out, he hewed them, he weighed them and exchanged them, he com-	(19a) Twenty-two letters: he carved them out, he hewed them, he weighed them, he exchanged them, he com-

[59] See Lambert 1891: 80, Kafach 1972: 117 and Weinstock 1981: 36.

[60] See Epstein 1894: 97 for the even wider figures for the number of gates that we get when we add in the readings of the medieval commentaries on SY.

bined them and formed with them the life of all creation and the life of all that would be formed.
(19b) How did he weigh and exchange them? – Aleph with them all, and them all with Aleph; Bet with them all, and them all with Bet. And they all rotate in turn. The result is that [they go out][61] by two hundred and twenty-one [gates][62]. The result is that all creation and all speech go out by one name.

bined them and formed with them the life of all creation and the life of all that would be formed. How did he weigh and exchange them? – Aleph with them all, and them all with Aleph; Bet with them all, and them all with Bet; Gimel with them all, and them all with Gimel. And they all rotate in turn. The result is that they go out by two hundred and twenty-one gates. The result is that all creation and all speech go out by one name.

them, he weighed them, and he exchanged them. How did he combine them? – Aleph with them all, and them all with Aleph; Bet with them all, and them all with Bet. And they all rotate in turn. The result is that they go out by two hundred and twenty-one gates. The result is that all creation and all speech go out by one name.

D

עשרים ושתים אותיות
יסוד חקקן חצבן שקלן
המירן צרפן וצר בהם נפש
כל היצור ונפש כל העתיד
לצור. כיצד שקלן והמירן
אלף עם כלם, וכלן עם אלף,
בית עם כלן וכלן עם בית
וכלן חוזרות חלילה נמצאו
יוצאות במאתים ושלשים
ואחד שערים נמצא כל
היצור וכל הדבור יוצא
בשם אחד

Z

עשרים ושתים אותיות חקקן
חצבן צרפן שקלן והמירן ויצר
בהן כל היצור וכל העתיד
לצור. וכאיזצד צרפן אלף עם
כלן וכולן עם אלף בית עם
כולן וכולן עם בית גימל עם
כולן וכולן עם גימל וכולן
חוזרות חלילה נמצאו יוצאות
במאתים ושלשים ואחד
שערים ונמצא כל הדבור וכל
היצור יוצא בשם אחד.

E

עשרים ושתים אותיות יסוד
שלוש אומות שבע כפולות
שתים עשרה פשוטות חקקן
חצבן צרפן שקלן והימירן
כאיזה צד צרפן אלף עם
כולן וכולן עם אלף בית עם
כולן וכולן עם בית וכולן
חוזרות חלילה נמצאו יוצאות
במאתים ועשרים ואחד
שערים נמצא כל היצור וכל
הדיבור יוצא בשם אלף אחד.

B¹B²GH collated to A:
אותיות] add יסוד B¹B²GH.
והעמידן G. והמירן 1⁰ & 2⁰]
אלף עם כולן צרפן [וצרפן
B¹H. יצר] וצר B². [בהן
מהם G. וכל]ונפש כל B².
ושלשים]ועשרים B¹G.

LMNSPIQR collated to K:
אותיות] add יסוד MNIQR.
ויצר]וצר MNQ.]ונפש כל
וכל MNPQR. עם]ועם L...
R. וחוזרות חלילה] om I,
נמצא S. וכולן חוזרות חלילה
נמצאו יוצאות]בית LP, נמצא
S, נמצאת MNQ, נמצאו I.
במאתים ועשרים ואחד[
ושלשים]ועשרים .I בתסב׳
LMNSP. עשרים 2⁰]

[61] Following the rest of the Mss. בית in Ms K does not make sense.
[62] Again with the rest of the Mss. עשרים in K is an obvious transpositional error for שערים.

שמהם נברא .L...R שערים
כל הדיבור.Q...L om] הכל
כל היצור וכל] וכל היצור
מהם [בשם אחד .SI הדבור
ונמצא כל היצור יוצא בשם
אחד LMNPQ.

Notes on the text of § 19

Again, as in § 18, Mss C and E offer the shortest text of this paragraph, once we discount the standard extension of the phrase עשרים ושתים אותיות יסוד, i.e. שלוש אומות שבע כפולות שתים עשרה פשוטות – missing in Z and the other Recensions, and only partly there in C. Crucially, C and E do not have the clause referring to the use of the letters in creation – וצר בהן נפש כל היצור ונפש כל העתיד לצור. The use of the word נפש here to mean "life" is unique in SY. Everywhere else in the book (§§ 30–34, 39, 41, 52, 58–9) it means "human being." Ms Z too omits it in its version of this clause – ויצר בהן כל היצור וכל העתיד לצור. Note also the absence of the second occurrence of this word in Mss MNPQR in the Short Recension and B^2 in the Long Recension. It looks, therefore, as though we can reconstruct from the Saadyan Recension an earlier form of the text of § 19a which read only: עשרים ושתים אותיות חקקן חצבן צרפן שקלן והימירן. The absence of the word נפש in this earlier form of SY would be decisive for settling the dispute between Peter Schäfer and Moshe Idel over the presence or absence of the idea of the *golem* in SY.[63]

חקקן חצבן שקלן והמירן וצרפן וצר. Whenever this chain of verbs occurs in SY inevitably the order of the words will vary in the Mss, not only across but also within the recensions.

וצר]ויצר Z, MNQ, B^2. This variant appears many times in the Mss of SY. Saadya, in commenting on § 41 (Lambert 1891: 94, Kafach 1972: 132) says that וצר בו is simply a variant form for ויצר בו and he quotes a series of similar abbreviated forms in the Bible, the rabbinic sources and especially the *paytanim*. Allony argues that the play between the two forms reflects the two-root letter linguistic theory which he attributes to the author of SY (1972: 81). However, what Allony does not do, either here or in the rest of his article (as Weinstock points out in his editorial note at the end of Allony 1981b: 50), is to pay attention to the attestation of these terms in the textual tradition of SY. If the Saadyan version has preserved the earlier form of § 19 then the word צר was not present in it. The evidence from the rest of SY is as follows: the phrase in which it occurs in §§ 4 and 6, i.e. דע וחשוב וצור, does not, as we have seen, belong to the earliest layer of the text; in § 20 only one Ms reads וצר against all the rest; in § 24 the Short Recension Mss omit דע וחשוב

[63] See Schäfer 1995:255–56.

וצור yet again; in §§ 32–34 most Short Recension Mss read וחתם instead of וצר; only in § 39 is צר attested in all Mss; §§ 41 and 52 where it occurs are not present in the Short Recension; in § 48 it is only found in the Long Recension while § 49 is not present in the Saadyan Recension; in § 61 it is not attested in all the Mss. My conclusion is that the word צר as an alternative to יצר probably belongs to a secondary layer of additions in the textual tradition of SY, from where it may occasionally (as in § 39) have crept into all the Mss. It probably reflects the influence of the interpretation of Isa 26:4 found in *y. Ḥag* 77c – כי ביה יהוה צור העולמים read as "for by (the letters) *Yudh He* the Lord created the worlds."

כאי צד שקלן והמירן. The Saadyan Recension has the slightly shorter כאיזה צד צרפן.

גימל עם כולן וכולן עם גימל. The extension to Gimel is found only in Mss ACZ. Donnolo (Castelli 1880: 43) extends it to Dalet. This would be an obvious addition for a scribe to make but, on the other hand, A and C are our oldest Mss of SY, so the omission of the phrase by parablepsis is a possible explanation for its absence in the majority of Mss.

For the variant ושלשים/ועשרים see notes on § 18. The variant בתסב' (Ms I) is found also in Judah ben Barzillai in both §§ 18 and 19 (Halberstam 208). Judah acknowledges the existence of the reading 221 but says 462 is the correct reading; it is achieved by counting in the reverse combinations of two letters, e.g. בא as well as אב to give 231 x 2 combinations, i.e. "Aleph with them all, and them all with Aleph." See also below on Dunash's commentary on § 21.

The reversal of כל הדיבור וכל היצור in Mss S and I reflects the Long Recension order.

The text of Ms K is very faulty in this paragraph. נמצא בית does not make any sense but the various attempts to correct the error in the Short Recension Mss suggest that the mistake occurred well back in the transmission line of the Recension. עשרים for שערים is clearly a transpositional error. שמהם נברא הכל is an idiosyncratic reading found only in Mss K and R.[64] It appears at the end of § 24a in the Saadyan Recension and reflects the attempt, discussed in connection with §§ 1 and 20 to insert the verb ברא into the text of SY.

We come finally to the main problem of the text of § 19: Mss KFR, Dunash (Vajda-Fenton 2002: 83 and 91), and Judah ben Barzillai (Halberstam 207 and 208) split it up into two halves and distribute them either side of §§ 17 and 18.[65] The rea-

[64] For the connection between K and R see the introduction § 8.3 and the notes to §§ 62–63.

[65] Although Mss B^{1}H in the Long Recension keep the parts of § 19 together their internal paragraph division (indicated by their numbering system) splits it into three parts: (1) עשרים....לצור; (2) כיצד...שערים; (3) ...נמצאו. The division at לצור is exactly the dividing point of the paragraph in the Short Recension Mss.

son for this re-ordering (if that is what it is) is not obvious since § 19b clearly picks up and develops the two verbs שקלן and המירן (צרפן in the case of the Saadyan Recension) from § 19a. But that then raises the possibility that § 19b arose as a later explanation of 19a. In which case, if the Saadyan form of § 18 is earlier than that of the other recensions, the original form of SY had no reference to the 231 gates or the permutation of the letters of the alphabet. And, as we shall see, § 21 with these lists of combinations is absent in many Mss. This is, of course, highly conjectural since § 19b does appear in all our Mss. However, the gates are missing in the Saadyan version of § 18 and some explanation is required for the distribution of the text in Mss KFR, Dunash and Judah.

Sefer Yeṣira § 20

K

יצר מתוהו ממש ועשה אותן ישנו וחצב עמודים גדולים מאויר שאינו נתפש. וזה סימן.

He formed substance from chaos, and he made them its existence, and he hewed out great columns from intangible air. This is the sign:

A

יצר מתוהו ממש ועשאו באש וישנו וחצב עמודים גדולים מאויר שאינו נתפש זה סימן:

He formed substance from chaos, and he made it with fire and it exists, and he hewed out great columns from intangible air. This is the sign:

C

ויצא מתוהו ממש ועשאו וכאנו וישנו וחצב עמודים גדולים שאינו נתפס מאויר.

And substance went out from chaos and he made it (?) and it exists, and he hewed out great columns from intangible air.

M

יצר מתוהו ועשה אמש ועשה את אינו ישנו וחצב עמודים גדולים מאויר שאינו נתפש. וזה אותיות אלף עם כלן וכלן עם אלף.

B^1

וצר מתוהו ממש ועשא את אינו ישנו וחצב עמודים גדולים מאויר שאינו נתפש.

Z

יצר מתוהו ממש ועשה את אינו ישנו וחצב עמודים גדולים מאויר שאינו נתפס.

S

יצר מתוהו ממש ועשה את אינו ישנו וחצב עמודים גדולים מאויר שאינו נתפש. וסימנם קדוש קדוש קדוש.

D

יצר מתהו ממש ועשה את אלו. יש לו וחצב עמודים גדולים מאויר שאינו נתפש וסימנם קדוש קדוש קדוש.

E

ויצר תהו ממש ועשאו מאינו ישנו. וחצב עמודים גדולים מאויר שאינו נתפס

N collated to M:
ועשה 1^o] om N. וזה] add סימן N.

B^2 = A except that זה סימן is in the margin.

LFPIQR collated to S:
יצר] add מאמש תוהו
LR. שאינו] אינו FIR. נתפש]

GH collated to B^1:
אשר אינו] אינו G. יצר] וצר
H. אבנים] עמודים גדולים

add בחללו של עולם L. וזה סימן האותיות [וסימנים LFPI. וזה [וסימנים...קדוש סימן IQR.

add וזה [נתפש G. גדולות סימן חשבון השערים הטב G.

Notes on the text of § 20

Many scribes seem to have exercised their creative talents in their attempts to update and correct what this paragraph says about God's creative work.[66] The majority of the Mss more or less follow the form of the text as found in Mss S B^1 and Z. This form of the paragraph seems clear and straightforward. At least, one can produce a translation which seems to make sense: "He formed substance from chaos, and made the non-existent exist, and hewed out great columns from intangible air". But there is clearly a tension in saying, "he made the non-existent exist" alongside "he formed substance from chaos". And as we have already seen in our consideration of § 1 it is terms like חצב and חקק which are the characteristic vocabulary of our author when we wishes to describe God's creative activity. They fit a view of creation in which God works with pre-existing material rather than the *creatio ex nihilo* which seems to lie behind "he made the non-existent exist."

Mss A and B^2, supported by the text presupposed in Donnolo's commentary offer a very different version of § 20. Donnolo, as so often, paraphrases the text of SY he has before him but it is not too difficult to work out what that was: יצר מתוהו ממש הוא חללו של עולם ועשאו באש והעמידו ויאמר לו די וישב וחצב עמודים גדולים מאויר שאינו נתפש. Presuming that וישב is an error for וישנו, Donnolo's text is identical with that of Mss A and B^2. This form of the text, though not as even as that in the majority of manuscripts, makes good sense, both in the light of parallels elsewhere in SY and especially in the light of the comments on Genesis chapter one found in Bereshit Rabba. The first clause (יצר מתוהו ממש) presupposes exactly the view of creation attributed to R.Huna in the name of Bar Qappara in Gen.R. 1:5, while the fire of the second clause (עשאו באש) will come from the well-known midrashic explanation of the word שמים (= אש ומים) cited in *b.Ḥag.* 12a and *Gen. R.* 4:7. This midrash is also behind the statement in SY §§ 14 and 28 that the heaven was created from fire. This version of § 20 fits, then, quite comfortably into the milieu of the rabbinic period.

It is much easier to explain the revision of the text found in Mss A, B^2, and Donnolo, into the text form found in the majority of Mss than the other way round. It fits in with the attempt which we isolated in our discussion of § 1 to insert the verb ברא into the text of SY. We know that Saadya was unhappy with the view of creation

[66] I have dealt in some detail with the text and interpretation of this paragraph in Hayman 1993. See that paper for a fuller attempt to justify the view of SY § 20 which I take here.

presented in SY, even with his updated version of § 20.[67] He offers a translation of § 20 which he more or less admits goes beyond what the Hebrew text says, because he thought even the formula עשא את אינו ישנו did not adequately exclude the view that God created the world out of something which already existed.[68] Others before him were clearly unhappy too with the earlier form of the text of SY § 20. The fall-out from this revision of the original text can be discerned in the garbled text of Ms C, and also in Ms E, both of which retain the first word of the second clause ועשאו. C has even retained וישנו which only makes sense in the context of the reading of A. Ms E takes us a little further along the road to the text as it appears in Z and the majority of Mss.

ויצא in Ms C is clearly an aural error for ויצר though Judah ben Barzillai reflects a similar reading – יוצא מתהו ממש (Halberstam 1885: 211). מאויר is obviously displaced since the singular שאינו נתפס cannot qualify the plural עמודים גדולים.

Light is thrown on the reading ועשה אמש (M) or יצר מאמש תוהו (LR) by the scribe of Paris 763, fol. 2a. His text of this paragraph is: יצר מתוהו ועשה יש מאין וחצב עמודים גדולים מאויר שאינו נתפש. But then he adds: ספר אחר יצר אמש: הוא חלל העולם . . . (Another Ms (reads): he formed Aleph, Mem, Shin – it is the hollow space of the world). This reading is a valiant attempt to connect § 20 to what follows in §§ 24–36. For the scribe's interpretation of the second reading see the variant in Ms L בחללו של עולם and Donnolo's paraphrase cited above.

ועשה את אלו יש לו in Ms D is presumably an error for ועשה את אינו ישנו.

זה סימן in Ms A and some Short Recension Mss is an introduction to § 21 with its columns of combinations of letters. The words are naturally missing in the Saadyan Recension which does not have § 21. The reading offered in Mss S and D (וסימנם קדוש קדוש קדוש) is a cross-sum gematria: קדוש = 100+4+6+300 = 410 x 3 = 1230 which by cross-sum gematria = 6 = the cross-sum gematria of 231 (the number of the gates).

The reading אבנים גדולות for עמודים גדולים in Ms G reflects the influence of § 40.

Sefer Yeṣira § 21

A

אל בת גש דר הק וץ זף חע טס ין כם
אב גת דש הר וק זץ חף תע ים כן לס
אד בג הת וש זר חק טץ יף כע לס מן
אג דת הש ור זק חץ טף יע כם לן בם
אה בד ות זש חר טק יץ כף לע מס גן

[67] See Hayman 1993: 223.

[68] He translates § 20: "He created something out of not from something, and made what did not exist exist, and he hewed out great columns from intangible air" (Lambert 1891: 84, Kafach 1972: 121). Note also Saadya's attempt to explain away the use of the verb חקק in § 1 (Lambert 1891:18, Kafach 1972: 42).

או בה גד זת חש טר יק כץ לף מע נס
אח בז גו דה טת יש כר לק מץ נף סע
אי בט גה דז הו כת לש מר נק סץ עף
אל בך גי דט הח וז מת נש סר עק פץ
אן בס גל דך הי וט זח סת עש פר צק
אע בס גן דם הל וך זי חט פת צש קר
אץ בף גע דס הן ום זל חך טי קת רש
אר בק גץ דף הע וס זן חם טל יך שת. [fol. 67b]
אש בר גק דץ הף וע זס חן טם יל כת

אז בו גה חת טש יר כק לץ מף נע דס
אט בח גז דו ית כש לר מק נץ סף הע
אך בי גט דח הן[1] לת מש נר סק עץ וף
אם בל גך די הט וח נת סש ער פק זץ
אס בן גם דל הך וי זט עת פש צר חק
אף בע גס דן הם ול זך חי צת קש טר
אק בץ גף דע הס ון זם חל טך רת יש
אפ בע גס דנ המ ול זכ חי צת קש טר
אע בס גן דם הל וך זי חט פת צש קר
אס בן גם דל הך וי זט עת פש צר חק
אנ במ גל דכ הי וט זח סת עש פר צק
אמ בל גכ די הט וח נת סש ער פק זץ
אל בכ גי דט הח וז מת נש סר עק פץ

[1] Error for הז.

K

אל בת גש דר הק וץ זף חע עף[1] ין כם.
אג דת הש ור זק חץ טף יע כס לן בם.
אה בד ות זש חר טק יץ כף לע מס גן
אז בו גה חת טש יר כק לץ מף נע דס.
אט בח גז דו ית כש לר מק נץ סף הע.

אב גת דש הר וק זץ חף טע יס כן לכ
אד בג הת וש זר חק טץ יף כע לס מן
או בה גד זת חש טר יק כץ לף מע נף[2]
אח בז גו דה טת יש כר לק מץ נף סע
אי בט גח דז הז לת מש כר סק עץ וף

[1] This should be טס. The פ looks as though it has been altered to ס and the ט is easily confused with ע in the script of this Ms. [2] נס K[c].

D

אר אר ו אר אר רו ו רו יוי. סימן לכב׳ אלפביות.

את	בש	גר	דק	הץ	וף	זע	חס	טן	ים	כל
אש	בר	גק	דצ	הף	וע	זס	חן	טמ	יל	כת
אר	בק	גץ	דף	הע	וס	זן	חמ	טל	יכ	שת
אק	בץ	גף	דע	הס	ון	זמ	חל	טכ	רת	יש
אץ	בף	גע	דס	הנ	ומ	זל	חכ	טי	קת	רש
אפ	בע	גס	דנ	המ	ול	זכ	חי	צת	קש	טר
אע	בס	גן	דם	הל	וכ	זי	חט	פת	צש	קר
אס	בן	גם	דל	הכ	וי	זט	עת	פס	צר	חק
אנ	במ	גל	דכ	הי	וט	זח	סת	עש	פר	צק
אמ	בל	גכ	די	הט	וח	נת	סש	ער	פק	זץ
אל	בכ	גי	דט	הח	וז	מת	נש	סר	עק	פץ

אכ	בי	גט	דח	הן	לת	מש	נר	סק	עת	וף
אי	בט	גח	דז	הו	כת	לש	מר	נק	סצ	עף
אט	בח	גז	דו	ית	כש	לר	מק	נץ	ספ	הע
אח	בז	גו	דה	טת	יש	כר	לק	מצ	נפ	סע
אז	בו	גה	חת	טש	יר	כק	לצ	מפ	נע	דס
או	בה	גד	זת	חש	טר	יק	כצ	לפ	מע	נס
אה	בד	ות	זש	חר	טק	יצ	כף	לע	מס	גנ
אד	בג	הת	וש	זר	חק	טצ	יפ	כע	לס	מנ
אג	דת	הש	ור	זק	חצ	טף	יע	כס	לנ	בש
אב	גת	דש	הר	וק	זצ	חף	טע	יס	כנ	למ
אל	בת	גש	דר	הק	וצ	זף	חף	טס	ין	כס

Notes on the text of § 21

§ 21 is missing in seven out of our nineteen Mss (GCZEMNQ) spread across all three recensions, and entirely missing in the Saadyan Recension. However, its omission in Ms G may just be an error since this Ms omits § 21–22 and resumes part way through § 23 at חובה. Hence its form of § 23 does not make sense on its own (חובה ולשון חק מכריע בינהים) and something must have preceded it in the scribe's exemplar. How much, of course, we cannot know. Gruenwald 1971: 21 prints only the text of Ms A with no apparatus, stating that nearly all the Mss contain errors but that A seems to be the least corrupted. Nevertheless, he detects two errors in it (I detect one) and it has eleven duplications in 242 combinations instead of the required 231. The text of Ms K is very similar to that of Ms A and would have been virtually identical if its scribe had not omitted the line וף . . . אך by homoioteleuton (וף ...וף). I have included the text of Ms D because it arranges the combinations in a different order from that of A and K – basically in reverse order (*atbash*). The meaning of its header line is unclear to me. I have followed the layout of the paragraph exactly as it appears in the manuscripts.

The relatively weak attestation of § 21 suggests that it belongs to that later layer of material which we have already identified emerging in the Long and Short Recension texts of § 18 from the shorter Saadyan version and which added § 19b as an interpretation of 19a. As it stands now in the majority of Mss § 21 appears to be an interpretation of the phrase וחצב עמודים גדולים in § 20. But originally this would have been simply a reference to the biblical pillars of heaven (Prov 9:1, Job 9:6, 26:11, etc.).

As for the early commentators, Donnolo organises the paragraph in a completely different way from our manuscripts resulting in 495 combinations, but Castelli (1880: 45, n. 3) notes that there are significant variants in the manuscripts he used for his edition. Dunash reports that the manuscript tradition of § 21 had reached him in a poor condition full of errors and misarrangements. He tells us that he laboured hard to put it back into its correct order, but the result is yet one more possible arrangement. He offers a second table with the reverse order of combinations in

order to illustrate the phrase "Aleph with them all, and them all with Aleph."[69] This produces the 462 combinations attested in Ms I's text of § 19. Judah ben Barzillai does not cite § 21 but he does discuss the different possible ways of combining the letters in apparent dependence upon Dunash (Halberstam 1885: 216). There seems to be a clear tendency both in the commentators and the manuscripts to transmit less carefully those parts of the SY tradition that could be characterised as commentary on or expansions of an earlier core text.

Sefer Yeṣira § 22

K

צופה ומימיר עושה את כל היצור ואת כל הדיבור שם אחד. וסימן לדבר עשרים חפיצים וגוף אח.

He looks and exchanges; he makes all creation and all speech one name. And a sign for the matter: twenty-two objects and one body.

LMNSFPIQR collated to K:
עשרים ושתים] עשרים L...IR. בגוף] וגוף MNIQ. אחד] אח L...R.

A

צופה ומימיר עושה את כל היצור ואת כל דיבור שם אחד וסימן לדבר עשרים ושתים חפצים בגוף אחד. חסלת.

He looks and exchanges; he makes all creation and all speech one name. And a sign for the matter: twenty-two objects in one category (or body).

B^1B^2 DH collated to A:
בגוף אחד] om B^1. בגוף] וגוף B^2D.

Notes on the text of § 22

The absence of this paragraph in the Saadyan Recension (and in Ms G) places a question mark over its presence in the early stages of the development of SY. Its language suggests a connection with the later layers of §§ 18–21 which we have already discussed. The second sentence – וסימן לדבר עשרים ושתים חפצים בגוף אחד also occurs in § 48b but is significantly absent in the Short Recension and Ms D.

The only significant Ms variant is וגוף (seven Mss) versus בגוף (six Mss) but absent in B^1, and with F (as we shall see) having both readings. How significant this is depends on how the paragraph is understood. There are no text-critical grounds for preferring one reading over another.

Ms K has two clear errors (omission of ושתים and אח) as the rest of the Short Recension Mss make clear. Ms F has two different versions of § 22 either side of § 21. Before it we find: צרפן והמירן ועשה את כל היצור ואת כל הדבור שם אחד וסימן לדבר כב׳ חפצים בגוף אחד; after it: צופה וממר עושה את כל היצור ואת כל הדבור שם אחד וסימן כב׳ וגוף אחד.

[69] Vajda-Fenton 2002: 231–32.

Sefer Yeṣira § 23

K

שלש אמות אמש יסודן כף זכות וכף חובה, ולשון חק מכריע בנתיים.

Three primary letters: Alef, Mem, Shin. Their basis is the scale of acquittal and the scale of guilt, and the language of law holds the balance between them.

LMNSFPIQR collated to K: אמש] add אד מל שט P. זכות] אחת M^2.

A

שלוש אימות אמש יסודן כף זכות וכף חובה ולשון חק מכריע בינתיים.

Three primary letters: Alef, Mem, Shin. Their basis is the scale of acquittal and the scale of guilt, and the language of law holds the balance between them.

B^1B^2GDH collated to A: יסודן] om H.

C

שלוש אומות אמש יסודן כף זכות וכף חובה ולשון חק מכריע בנתיים.

Three primary letters: Alef, Mem, Shin. Their basis is the scale of acquittal and the scale of guilt, and the language of law holds the balance between them.

ZE = C:

Notes on the text of § 23

§ 23 is attested in all our Mss with an almost uniform text. It clearly belongs to the earliest recoverable stage of SY. In Mss A and K it begins their third chapter devoted to the three mothers. For the position of this paragraph in the various recensions see the notes to §§ 9 and 17. In Mss MNFIQ this paragraph appears in two places – here and after § 9. Its placing after § 9 may reflect the influence of the Saadyan Recension since the order 9, 23 reflects the logic of the paragraph order in that recension. In the apparatus M^2 = the version of § 23 which appears on the second occasion after § 22. For the defective form of the paragraph in Ms G see the notes to § 21.

Sefer Yeṣira § 24

K

שלש אמות אמש סוד גדול מכוסה ומופלא[1] וחתום בשש טבעות וממנו יוצאים אש ומים ורוח ומתחלקין זכר ונקבה.

[1] The scribe originally wrote ופולא and then added מ above it, leaving it uncertain as to whether to read ומופלא or ומפולא.

A

שלוש אימות אמש סוד גדול מכוסה ומופלא וחתום בשש טבעות וממנו יוצאין אש מים ורוח ומחותל בזכר ונקבה דע וחשב וצור שהאש נושא מים.

C

(24a) עשרים ושתים אותיות יסוד שלוש אומו[ת] שבע כפולות ושתים עשרה פשוטות שלוש אומ[ות] אמש סוד גדול מכוסא ומופלא ומפואר שמ[מנו] יוצאין אש ורוח ומים שמהם נברא הכל.
(24b) אמש חותם בטבעת ומחותל בזכר ונקבה דע וחשב וצור שהאש נושא מים.

Three primary letters: Alef, Mem, Shin – a great secret, hidden and ineffable, and sealed with six seals. And from it goes out fire, and water and air, and it is divided into male and female.	Three primary letters: Alef, Mem, Shin – a great secret, hidden and ineffable, and sealed with six seals. And from it goes out fire, water and air, and it is wrapped up in male and female. Know and ponder and form (a mental image) that fire evaporates water.	(24a) The twenty-two letters are the foundation: three primary letters, seven double (letters), and twelve simple (letters). Three primary letters: Alef, Mem, Shin – a great secret, hidden and ineffable and glorious from which go out fire and air and water, from which everything was created. (24b) Alef, Mem, Shin – sealed with a seal wrapped up in male and female. Know and ponder and form (a mental image) that fire evaporates water.
	G omits from שהאש to § 25 (אש[1]°) homoio.	24 a = chapter 2:2 in Z; 24b = chapter 3:2.
LMNSFPIQR collated to K: מופלא [מכוסה ומופלא ומכוסה MNFPIQ. וממנו] ומהם LMNPQ.	B[1]B[2]GDH collated to A: מופלא [מכוסה ומופלא ומכוסה DH. דע] om B[1].	ZE collated to C: חתום בשש [חותם בטבעת טבעות ZE.

Notes on the text of § 24

§ 24 has a fixed position after §§ 20–23 in the Long and Short Recensions but is split into two in the Saadyan Recension and the parts are assigned to Saadya's chapters 2:2 and 3:2. For the insertion of § 9 into § 24a in the Saadyan Recension see the notes to § 9. Probably the splitting up of § 24 into two parts also results from the editorial reshaping of the text of SY which produced this recension. The process of growth of the paragraph seems to have been from the Short Recension to the Long Recension and finally the Saadyan Recension. The sentence דע וחשב וצור שהאש נושא מים in the Long and Saadyan Recensions is not attested in the Short Recension and we have already seen that whenever the phrase דע וחשב וצור occurs in SY it is never attested in all three recensions; see the notes to §§ 4, 6, and 19. שהאש נושא מים is found in the next paragraph though only in the Short Recension. In the Saadyan form of § 24a מפואר adds one more numinous adjective to מכוסא ומופלא while for שמהם נברא הכל see § 19b (Mss K and R). Ms Paris 770 may take us back a stage in the process whereby the Saadyan version of this paragraph emerged from the Short Recension since remnants of the Short Recension appear in its text of this paragraph – for ומפואר it has וחתום ומפואר, and the last clause of § 24a (after ומים) reads

ומתחלקין זכר ונקבה שלהם נברא הכל. On the other hand, the text of this Ms may be a deliberate and later attempt to reintegrate the text of these two recensions.

מחותל/ומחותל. מחותל is a very rare word – the Pual of חתל occurs only once in the Bible in Ezek 16:4. It is probable that the obscurity of the word occasioned the change to the much more recognisable מתחלקין in the Short Recension.

The reversal of the order of מכוסה ומופלא in Mss MNFPIQDH probably reflects the language of Ecclus 3:21a as quoted in *b Ḥag* 13a – במפלא ממך אל תדרש ובמכוסה ממך אל תחקר.

The order of the words אש ומים ורוח is unstable in the Mss. Contrast the order in the Saadyan Recension which agrees with that in § 35 which, however, it does not attest. In §§ 11–14 and 28 the order is רוח מים אש while in §§ 25, 29, 30 we find the same order as that of § 24.

חתום בשש טבעות in Mss ZE seems preferable to חותם בטבעת in Ms C in the light of the other Mss and the probable reference to the six permutations of the letters אמש.

Sefer Yeṣira § 25

K	A	C
שלשה. אש ומים. ורוח אש למעלה. מים למטה ורוח בנתיים. וזה סימן לדבר שהאש נושאה את המים.	שלוש אימות אמש תולדות השמים אש תולדות אויר רוח תולדות ארץ מים אש למעלה מים למטה ורוח חק מכריע בינתיים.	שלוש אומות: אמש. תולדות שמים אש תולדות אויר רוח תולדות ארץ מים. אש למעלה ומים למטה רוח חוק מכריע בנתיים.
Three – fire, water and air; fire above, water below, and air is between them. And this is a sign for the matter that fire evaporates water.	Three primary letters: Alef, Mem, Shin. The offspring of heaven is fire; the offspring of air is the Spirit; the offspring of earth is water; fire above, water below, and air is the balancing item.	Three primary letters: Alef, Mem, Shin. The offspring of heaven is fire; the offspring of air is the Spirit; the offspring of earth is water; fire above, water below, air is the balancing item.
LMNSFPIQR collated to K: ורוח 2⁰] add חק מכריע MNFIQ.	B¹B²GDH collated to A: חק] om H.	ZE collated to C: אמש] add אש ורוח ומים Z. תולדות אש] תולדות שמים רוח ומים שמים E.

Notes on the text of § 25

In the Short Recension this paragraph appears in the middle of § 59. We will deal with this issue in the notes on § 26 and § 59. Here we will concentrate on the problem of the widely divergent text of this paragraph in the three recensions. It is sig-

nificant that, only for the second time so far (the other is § 19), Gruenwald's attempt to present a unitary text of SY is abandoned and he is forced to print the text of the Short and Long Recensions in parallel columns (1971: 152).

Perhaps the best way to tackle the problems of this paragraph is to begin by isolating the common material which appears in all three recensions:

שלשה אש למעלה מים למטה ורוח בנתיים

This is a short, simple statement which explicates well the underlying principle of the header statement § 23. It is then similar to the structure of § 26 and, to a slightly less extent, §§ 29–30. Perhaps the phrase חק מכריע attested in all Mss except KLSR[70] and by Dunash (Vajda-Fenton 2002: 135) should be seen as part of this core because of its presence in § 23. Possibly also we should retain אמות after שלוש with the Long and Short Recensions. Our core then becomes

שלשה [אמות] אש למעלה מים למטה ורוח [חק מכריע] בנתיים

Can we develop a plausible argument for how our recensions could have arisen from this possible core? To begin with, the intrusive nature of the specification of what אמש represents, namely אש ורוח ומים is clear from its position in Ms E and its absence in our two oldest Mss (A and C). Ms Z differs from C only in the addition of these words. The second major addition – in the Long and Saadyan Recensions, is the words תולדות השמים אש תולדות אויר רוח תולדות ארץ מים. This restates the substance of §§ 28 and 35 in different language. There is one significant change of wording in this addition when we compare it and § 28 with § 12:

§ 12	שתים רוח מרוח	Two – air from Spirit
§ 25	תולדות אויר רוח	the offspring of air is the Spirit
§ 28	ואויר נברא מרוח	and air was created from the Spirit

In §§ 25 and 28 the word אויר is introduced in order to resolve the ambiguity of the two senses in which רוח is used in § 12.[71] But the artificiality of the insertion in § 25 becomes clear when in the final phrase ורוח חק מכריע בינתיים (which belongs to our presumed core) רוח again has the meaning "air". But there is another more serious contradiction introduced by this presumed second expansion of our paragraph – the use of the word תולדות. § 12 presupposes that the air is the "offspring" of the Spirit and not vice versa, § 13 that earth comes from water and not water from earth, and § 14 that the heavens are created out of fire. § 28 states this explicitly

[69] Vajda-Fenton 2002: 231–32.

[70] Judah ben Barzillai's text is identical with that of Ms K (Halberstam 1885: 257).

[71] It is, of course, possible that the use of both רוח and אויר in SY represents an attempt to translate into Hebrew the Greek distinction between αἰθήρ and ἀήρ; see Guthrie, *A History of Greek Philosophy*, II, 145. For the possible background to this paragraph in classical and rabbinic thought see Epstein 1894: 29, 66–68. Liebes (2000: 29) sees no ambiguity in § 12 since for him רוח אלהים in SY = God, and the רוח which comes from him = אויר.

and is in clear contradiction with the Long and Saadyan versions of § 25. The word order of § 35 (שמים אש אויר רוח ארץ מים) supports the addition in § 25 but § 35 is not attested in the Short Recension. The discrepancy can be resolved by assuming that תולדות השמים אש תולדות אויר רוח תולדות ארץ מים and the whole of § 35 (and, as we shall see, § 27) are a later layer of material. The problem then, becomes one of why should a scribe or scribes have wanted to introduce a discrepancy into the text of SY. Of course, this would not be the first time that a scribe, trying to be helpful, actually made matters worse (!) but, perhaps, we should see here no more than the over-riding influence of Gen 2:4a (תולדות השמים) which then drives the parallel construction of the next two clauses.[72]

Finally we come to the sentence וזה סימן לדבר שהאש נושאה את המים in the Short Recension, the last part of which we have already seen in § 24 – but not in the Short Recension. Its absence here in the Long and Saadyan Recensions (including our two earliest Mss) must count against its belonging to the earliest recoverable stage of SY. It looks very like the sort of brief explanatory comment that characterises, for example, the sort of paraphrastic rendering of SY which we find in Donnolo's *Ḥakhmoni*. It is a commonplace observation recorded as far back as Anaximander and Heraclitus.[73]

I suggest, then, that it is possible to argue that the existing recensions have arisen from an earlier, shorter version, the substance of which can still be seen in all three of them.

Sefer Yeṣira § 26

K

שלש אמות אמש מם רוממת ושין שורקת ואלף חק מכריע בנתים.

Three primary letters: Alef, Mem, Shin. Mem lifts up, and Shin hisses, and Alef is the balancing item.

A

שלוש אימות אמש מם רוממת, שין שורקת, אלף חק מכריע בינתיים.

Three primary letters: Alef, Mem, Shin. Mem lifts up, Shin hisses, Alef is the balancing item.

C

מם דוממת שין שורקת אלף חק מכריע בנתיים.

Mem is silent, Shin hisses, Alef is the balancing item.

Q

מם דוממת שין שורקת. אלף רוח חק מכריע בנתים.

D

שלש אמות אמש מם דוממת שין שורקת. אלף רוח חק מכריע בנתים.

[72] See Liebes 2000: 21–34 for a discussion of the internal contradictions in SY between these paragraphs and an attempt to resolve them without, however, taking full account of the text-critical data.

[73] See Guthrie (*ibid.*), I: 81, II: 434.

LMNSFPIR collated to K:
שלש אמות אמש] om MNI.
דוממת ורוממת] LMNFPI.
חק חק רוח חד] LSI, רוח חק P.

This paragraph is missing in B^1 and H.
B^2G = A.

ZE collated to C:
דוממת ורוממת] ZE.

Notes on the text of § 26

In the Long Recension this paragraph has a fixed position within chapter three (§§ 23–36) which deals with the "three mothers." Accordingly, it begins with the rubric שלוש אימות אמש which introduces most of these paragraphs. Like § 25 it provides a further explanation of the principle announced in § 23. The Saadyan Recension preserves the sequence §§ 25–26 within its chapter 3:2. In that context the rubric is not required since §§ 25, 26, and 24b are integrated under the general rubric which is § 9. The Short Recension distribution of this and the previous paragraph is highly eccentric. All the Short Recension Mss insert § 25 between the two halves of § 59, while MNFPIQ insert both §§ 25 and 26 in this position. The insertion of § 26 in this position and its merging with § 25 explains the omission of the introductory rubric in Mss MNI; it is no longer needed.

Inserted within § 59, §§ 25–26 would seem to be out of place. They clearly belong with all the other paragraphs (23–36) which deal with the "three mothers." §§ 59 and 26 have the word חק in common and the arrangement may have arisen from some scribe who felt that § 26 threw light on § 59. Note, for example, how in Ms F § 26 is retained in its original position with the other 'three mothers" paragraphs but is then repeated before § 59b. In Ms Q § 26 first appears in the sequence 9, 23, 26, 17–22, and then appears again with § 25 before § 59b. It is also out of sequence in Ms L (being placed after § 9 and before § 17). Clearly § 26 has a rather uncertain position in the Short Recension and this may be due to the attempt to align it with § 59. Subsequently in some Short Recension manuscripts § 25 may have got dragged in along with § 26 to its present position in the middle of § 59. Or, if the words חק מקריע are part of the earlier text of § 25 it could have been deliberately extracted along with § 26 in order to throw light on § 59a. We conclude, then, that the rubric שלוש אימות אמש probably belonged to the earlier text of SY on the assumption that the original locus of § 26 was within §§ 23–36 (chapter 3).

Apart from the problem of the rubric, there are three other textual problems to be considered. The absence of the whole paragraph within Mss B^1 and H is easily explained by homoioarcton as the scribes' eyes (or is it the scribe's eye?[74]) jumped from the rubric at the beginning of § 26 to that at the beginning of § 27. Our second major problem is the variant דוממת/ רוממת. It is easy to see how this arose, since distinguishing between Dalet and Resh in medieval Hebrew Mss is often extremely difficult. I generally agree with Gruenwald in the readings of the Mss at this point,

[74] See the introduction § 8.1.

except that he has not recorded the reading of Ms L. However, I cannot be certain of the reading in all cases. But דוממת clearly makes the best sense in this context and is almost certainly original.[75] Finally, the insertion of רוח after אלף in Mss QLSI (P?) D is probably a gloss explaining that אלף here is the equivalent of רוח in § 25. Or it is simply imported by error from § 25?

Sefer Yeṣira § 27

K

שלש אמות אמש ומהן נולדו שלושה אבות שמהם נבראו הכל.

Three primary letters: Alef, Mem, Shin. And from them were born three fathers from whom everything was created.

LMNSFIQR collated to K:
אמש] add יסודן MNFIQ. נולדו] om LF. שלושה] om F.

A

שלוש אימות אמש ומהן נולדו שלושה אבות שמהם נבראו הכל.

Three primary letters: Alef, Mem, Shin. And from them were born three fathers from whom everything was created.

B^1B^2GD collated to A:
נולדו] om B^1. אבות] om B^2.

Notes on the text of § 27

§§ 27–31 are missing in the Saadyan Recension and that immediately poses a problem. One's first reaction is to suspect omission by homoioarcton similar to the dropping of § 26 in Mss B^1 and H or § 30 in Mss M and N. This almost certainly explains the dropping of our paragraph in Mss H and P.[76] However, § 32 does not begin with שלוש אימות אמש, assuming that the paragraph order ran originally as it is now in most Mss of the Long and Short Recensions. And when we look more closely at the content of these paragraphs problems begin to multiply. Basically they recycle material which appears in a different format in §§ 32–34. §§ 28–30 are structured around the verb ברא which we have already seen reason to assign to a later stage of the SY tradition; see the notes to § 1. §§ 32–34 (attested in all three recensions) revert to the verb צר which is more securely rooted in the textual tradition of SY. However, as we shall see when we reach § 32, there is a question mark over the original place of §§ 32–34 themselves in the earlier SY tradition.

[75] It is difficult to work out what Hebrew text Saadya had before him since he takes this paragraph to be drawing analogies from the physical shape of the letters rather than from their pronunciation and translates accordingly; see Kafach 1972: 26, n. 26 and Lambert 1891: 82, n. 1. Donnolo obviously read דוממת as his comment shows: אות המם נאמרה בדממה (Castelli 46). Dunash does not comment on § 26. Judah ben Barzillai knows and attempts to interpret both readings, though clearly under the influence of Saadya's commentary (Halberstam 1885: 220–222).

[76] But note that Ms P has a variant version of this paragraph as its § 50.

As for the content of § 27 Goldschmidt regards it as "zweifellos unächt; auch stimmt er inhaltlich mit der sonstigen Annahme des Verfassers nicht überein" (1894: 86). I am inclined to accept this judgement. It seems to me that § 27 is related to the secondary layer of material which we divined in § 25: תולדות השמים אש תולדות אויר רוח תולדות ארץ מים. § 58 explicitly makes this connection in its opening sentence: שלשה אבות ותולדותיהן. However, § 58 (which is attested in all recensions) turns the relationship around: instead of, as here in § 27, mothers giving birth to fathers it has "three fathers and their offspring." Neither תולדות השמים אש תולדות אויר רוח תולדות ארץ מים in § 25 nor § 27 can be easily reconciled with § 58. Perhaps we can understand why the scribe of Ms B^2 omits אבות in § 27! The text of Mss MNFP in § 50 is another attempt to sort out the mess. They do so by simply identifying "the mothers" and "the fathers": שלש אמות שהן שלשה אבות. Judah ben Barzillai seems to opt for the same solution (Halberstam 1885: 222). Donnolo struggles vainly with the problem and tries to have it both ways: תולדות האש השמים ותולדות השמים אש (Castelli 1880: 46). But if we assign the addition in § 25 and the whole of §§ 27–30 (31) to a secondary stage in the evolution of SY we will have to assume that this material itself, not being internally consistent, contains at least two layers, since the addition in § 25 contradicts § 28.

יסודן in Mss MNFIQ (and Judah ben Barzillai) has come in from § 23.

Sefer Yeṣira § 28

A

שלוש אימות אמש בעולם רוח ומים ואש
שמים נבראו תחילה מאש, וארץ נבראת
ממים, ואויר נברא מרוח מכריע בינתיים.

Three primary letters – Alef, Mem, Shin – in the universe: air, and water and fire. Heaven was created first from fire, and earth was created from water, and air was created from the Spirit, holding the balance between them.

B¹B²GD collated to A:
אש ורוח ומים [רוח ומים ואש D.

K

שלש אמות אמש בעולם רוח ומים ואש.
שמים נבראו תחלה מאש, וארץ [fol. 37b]
נבראת ממים, ואור נברא מרוח מכריע בנתים.

Three primary letters – Alef, Mem, Shin – in the universe: air, and water and fire. Heaven was created first from fire, and earth was created from water, and light [air][77] was created from the Spirit, holding the balance between them.

LMNSFPIQR collated to K:
בעולם] om Q. ואויר ואור] L...Q.

[77] The reading of all the other manuscripts.

Notes on the text of § 28

The textual tradition of this paragraph is uniform and presents no problems. The only issue is, as we have discussed above, its absence in the Saadyan Recension and its compatibility with the Long and Saadyan Recensions of § 25 and with § 58. The paragraph is again missing in Ms H but not this time in B^1. אור in Ms K is more likely to be an error than *scriptio defectiva*.

Sefer Yeṣira § 29

K

שלש אמות אמש בשנה אש ומים ורוח. חום נברא מאש, וקור נברא ממים, ורויה מרוח מכריע בנתיים.

Three primary letters – Alef, Mem, Shin – in the year: fire, and water and air. Heat was created from fire, and cold was created from water, and humidity from air holding the balance between them.

A

שלוש אימות אמש בשנה אש מים ורוח חום נברא מאש, קור נברא ממים, רוויה רוח מכריע בינתיים.

Three primary letters – Alef, Mem, Shin – in the year: fire, water and air. Heat was created from fire, cold was created from water, humidity is the air holding the balance between them.

D

שלש אמות אמש בשנה. חום וקור. ורויה. חום נברא מאש. וקור נברא ממים. ורויה מרוח מכריע בנתים.

LMNSFIQR collated to K:
בשנה] om Q. חום וחור ורויה [אש ומים ורוח LMNIQ. נבראת מרוח [מרוח] I.

B^1B^2H collated to A:
נברא מרוח [רוח] B^2.

Notes on the text of § 29

For the general question of the place of this paragraph in the SY textual tradition see the notes on § 27. The replacement of אש ומים ורוח by חום וחור ורויה in Mss LMNIQ and D is parallel to the addition of ראש ובטן וגויה in § 30 by Mss LFPI and D. What is created by "the mothers" is felt to be more appropriate here. In § 28 only "the mothers" are specified. The absence in most Mss of § 30 of any specification after בנפש raises the possibility that at an earlier stage no specification at all was present after בעולם in § 28 or after בשנה in § 29.

Mss AB^1H read רוח against מרוח in all the other Mss. מרוח fits better the pattern of the rest of the paragraph and the formulation in § 28 – ואויר נברא מרוח מכריע בינתיים. We find the same set of variants in the next paragraph.

נברא in B^2 and נבראת in Ms I reflect the influence of the previous paragraph.

Mss G and P omit the paragraph by homoioarcton.

Sefer Yeṣira § 30

K

שלש אמות אמש בנפש. ראש נברא מאש, ובטן ממים, וגויה רוח מכריע בינתיים.

Three primary letters – Alef, Mem, Shin – in mankind. The head was created from fire, the belly from water, and the chest[78] from air holding the balance between them.

LSFPIQR collated to K:
בנפש] om Q, add ראש ובטן וגויה LFPI.
מרוח] om Q.

A

שלוש אימות אמש בנפש ראש נברא מאש, ובטן ממים, וגיויה רוח מכריע בינתיים.

Three primary letters – Alef, Mem, Shin – in mankind. The head was created from fire, the belly from water, and the chest is the air holding the balance between them.

B^1B^2GH collated to A:
בנפש] add ראש ובטן וגויה D, אש ומים ובטן נברא [ובטן B^2. וגויה ורוח D. רוח] מרוח B^2.

Notes to the text of § 30

For the variant רוח\מרוח and the addition of ראש ובטן וגויה in Mss LFPI and D see the notes to § 29. Probably the scribe of Ms B^2 intended to make this same addition but confused it with part of § 29. Apart from these there are no significant variants in the textual tradition of this paragraph. For its absence in the Saadyan Recension see the notes to § 27.

Mss M and N omit the paragraph almost certainly through homoioarcton. For their shared readings see the Introduction § 8.3.

Sefer Yeṣira § 31

K

שלש אמות אמש. חקקן, חצבן, צרפן, וצר בהן שלש אמות בעולם, ושלש אמות בשנה ושלש אמות בנפש זכר ונקבה.

Three primary letters: Alef, Mem, Shin. He carved them, hewed them, combined them and formed with them the three primary letters in the universe, and the three primary letters in the year, and the three primary letters in mankind, male and female.

LMNSFPIQR collated to K:
וצר] pr שקלן MN, וחתם FI, יצר Q.

A

שלוש אימות אמש חקקן חצבן צרפן וחתם בהן שלוש אימות בעולם ושלוש אימות בשנה ושלוש אימות בנפש זכר ונקבה.

Three primary letters: Alef, Mem, Shin. He carved them, hewed them, combined them and sealed with them the three primary letters in the universe, and the three primary letters in the year, and the three primary letters in mankind, male and female.

B^1B^2GDH collated to A:
צרפן] add והמירן D.

[78] Following Donnolo's gloss: ומן הגויה ומן החזה יולד רוח הוא נשמת הרוח המכריע בנתים לבו רוח. (Castelli 1880: 47). See also § 35 –

Notes on the text of § 31

וצר/וחתם. In the notes to § 19 we saw that the biliteral form צר (as against the triliteral יצר) probably belonged to a later stage in the evolution of the text of SY. But we also saw that the earliest recoverable text of that paragraph contained no reference to the use of the letters of the alphabet in creation. The Long Recension form here of § 31 (supported by Mss FI from the Short Recension), reading וחתם instead of וצר, is in line with that early form of § 19.[79] Precisely the same variant recurs throughout §§ 32–34, but there it is the Short Recension which reads וחתם while the Long and Saadyan Recensions have וצר. Ms B^2 throughout these three paragraphs has the double reading וחתם וצר. This textual variant impinges directly on our understanding of how the creative process was envisaged by the author of SY. Are the letters agents in the process of creation (as they certainly are according to §§ 39 and 48–49) or just, as in § 15 and by implication in § 24, used to seal the various parts of the created universe? We will have to revisit this issue when we come to consider §§ 32–34 and especially §§ 41 and 52. It is not easy to obtain a consistent picture of how the earliest recoverable form of SY envisaged the role of the letters in the creative process.

The additions of שקלן in Mss MN and והמירן in D are typical of variants which occur in the Mss wherever this chain of verbs appears in SY; see, for example, § 19.

We have seen that the omission of §§ 27–31 in the Saadyan Recension inevitably raises a question about their presence in the earliest recoverable stage of the text of SY. In the case of §§ 27–30 there were additional problems over their vocabulary and the internal consistency of their content. No such problems occur over the vocabulary of § 31. The words חקקן חצבן צרפן וחתם belong to the core vocabulary of SY; see §§ 1, 12–14, 15, 17a, 19a, 39, 48–49. § 39, which is constructed on the same pattern as § 31 (and, incidentally has all MSS reading וצר) is attested in all three recensions. Similarly, in the highly complex jumble of §§ 48–49 all Mss attest a structure parallel to §§ 31 and 39. So, on the basis of its structure a good case could be made out for the presence of § 31 in an earlier form of the text of SY. We would then have to assume its accidental omission from the manuscript out of which the Saadyan Recension was constructed.

---

[79] Of our three early commentators, Donnolo (Castelli 1880: 47) and Judah ben Barzillai (Halberstam 1885: 224) support the reading וחתם. Dunash, according to Vajda-Fenton 2002: 106 has "scellé" (= וחתם) but the Hebrew text cited in the Geniza fragment of Dunash's commentary has יצר (Vajda 1954: 50). Epstein 1894: 73, n. 5, argues that the correct reading is וחתם: "pour les lettres אמ״ש, presques tous les texts ont, non pas וצר, mais וחתם, parce que les trois substances fondamentales avaient déja une existence idéale ... Pour les objets créés avec les sept autres doubles (ch. IV) et et les douze lettres simples (ch. V), on emploie le mot וצר parce qu'il s'agit là de créations véritables. Saadia a le mot צר même pour les lettres אמ״ש (V, 1), parce qu'il a réuni arbitrairement toutes les trois classes des lettres dans un même paragraphe et qu'il s'est servi invariablement du même terme צר pour toutes les lettres, même pour אמ״ש." Epstein correctly observes that the variant וחתם does not appear in §§ 39 and 48–49.

The content of our paragraph is, however, problematic. As the translation above shows it does not make sense: God either forms the "three mothers" by means of the "three mothers" (Short Recension) or seals them with themselves (Long Recension). On the basis of the parallels with §§ 39 and 48–49 the object of the verbs חתם/צר in § 31 should have been אויר ארץ שמים בעולם, חום קור רויה בשנה, ראש בטן גויה בנפש– precisely what is presupposed by §§ 32–34. We are faced then with two sets of alternatives: (1) either the muddle goes back to the original author or it was created by an early scribe who saw that § 39 and 48–49 required a parallel statement for the "three mothers" to the one made for the "seven doubles" and the "twelve simples;" (2) either the person responsible for the Saadyan Recension did not have § 31 in the text before him or he left it out because it did not make sense. We do not possess the relevant data to make a choice between these alternatives possible. With some hesitation I conclude that § 31 should not be included in my attempt to reconstruct the earliest recoverable text of SY.

Sefer Yeṣira § 32

K

המליך את אלף ברוח וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זו עם זו וחתם בהן אויר בעולם רויה בשנה וגויה בנפש זכר באמש ונקבה באשם.

He made Alef rule over air (*ruah*), and bound to it a crown, and combined them with each other, and sealed with them air (*awir*) in the universe, humidity in the year, and the chest in mankind – male with Alef, Mem, Shin, and female with Alef, Shin, Mem.

LMNSFPIQR collated to K:
וחתם] וצר MNF, ויצר Q.
בנפש] add זכר ונקבה LMNPQ.

A

המליך את אלף ברוח וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה בזה וצר בהן אויר בעולם ורווייה בשנה וגיויה בנפש זכר ונקבה זכר באמש ונקבה באשם.

He made Alef rule over air (*ruah*), and bound to it a crown, and combined them with each other, and formed with them air (*awir*) in the universe, and humidity in the year, and the chest in mankind, male and female – male with Alef, Mem, Shin, and female with Alef, Shin, Mem.

B¹B²GDH collated to A:
וצר] pr וחתם B². בשנה] om B¹G.

C

המליך את אלף ברוח וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו אויר בעולם ורויווה בשנה וגוויה בנפש זכר ונקבה זכר באמש ונקבה באשם.

He made Alef rule over air (*ruah*), and bound to it a crown, and combined them with each other, and formed with it air (*awir*) in the universe, and humidity in the year, and the chest in mankind, male and female – male with Alef, Mem, Shin, and female with Alef, Shin, Mem.

ZE collated to C:
ורויווה] ורויה ZE.

Sefer Yeṣira § 33

K

המליך את מם במים וקשר לו כתר וחתם בו ארץ בעולם וקור בשנה ופרי בטן בנפש זכר במשא ונקבה במאש.

He made Mem rule over water, and bound to it a crown, and sealed with it earth in the universe, cold in the year, and the fruit of the belly in mankind, male with Mem, Shin, Aleph, and female with Mem, Aleph, Shin.

LMNSFPIQR collated to K:
וצרפן זה עם זה add] כתר LPIQ (זה בזה). בהם [בו PI. ובטן [ופרי בטן I, ופרי נפש בבטן F. בנפש] om PQ. ...זכר זכר ונקבה [במאש LMNSFPIQ.

A

המליך את מם במים וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה בזה וצר בו ארץ בעולם וקור בשנה ובטן בנפש [fol. 68a] זכר ונקבה.

He made Mem rule over water, and bound to it a crown, and combined them with each other, and formed with it earth in the universe, cold in the year, and the belly in mankind, male and female.

B^1B^2GDH collated to A:
וצר] pr וחתם B^2. בהן [בו GD.

C

המליך את מם במים וקשר לו כתר וצר בו ארץ בעולם וקור בשנה ובטן בנפש.

He made Mem rule over water, and bound to it a crown, and formed with it earth in the universe, cold in the year, and the belly in mankind.

ZE collated to C:
וצרפן זה עם זה add] כתר ZE.

Sefer Yeṣira § 34

K

המליך את שין באש וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זו עם זה וחתם בו שמים בעולם, וחום בשנה, וראש בנפש זכר בשמא ונקבה בשאם.

He made Shin rule over fire, and bound to it a crown, and combined them with each other, and sealed with it heaven in the universe, heat in the year, and the head in mankind, male with Shin, Mem, Aleph, and female with Shin, Aleph, Mem.

LMNSFPIQR collated to K:
בהן [בו LMNPIQ. ...זכר זכר ונקבה [בשאם L...Q.

A

המליך את שין באש וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו שמים בעולם וחום בשנה וראש בנפש זכר ונקבה.

He made Shin rule over fire, and bound to it a crown, and combined them with each other, and formed with it heaven in the universe, heat in the year, and the head in mankind, male and female.

B^1B^2GDH collated to A:
וצר] pr וחתם B^2. בהן [בו B^1GD.

C

המליך את שין באש וקשר לו כתר וצר בו שמים בעלם וחום בשנה וראש בנפש זכר ונקבה.

He made Shin rule over fire, and bound to it a crown, and formed with it heaven in the universe, heat in the year, and the head in mankind, male and female.

ZE collated to C:
וצרפן זה עם זה add] כתר ZE.

Notes on the text of §§ 32–34

These paragraphs are best taken together since they are constructed on the same pattern and exhibit the same suite of textual variants. It is possible to isolate a core structure attested in all three recensions and some floating elements which appear at random in the various Mss. The core structure is:

המליך את	אלף/מם/שין	רוח/מים/אש	
וקשר לו כתר	וצר/חתם בו	אויר/ארץ/שמים	בעולם
		ורויה/קור/חום	בשנה
		וגויה/בטן/ראש	בשנה

The floating elements are:

וצרפן זה עם זה
זכר ונקבה
זכר ב . . . נקבה ב . . .

The floating element וצרפן זה עם זה can also be observed in the parallel § 41 but especially in § 52 where it is not present in Mss CE and D. זכר ונקבה comes from § 24 but, of course, ultimately from Gen 1:27. It is present in § 31 but we have seen that there is a question mark over the status of this paragraph in the SY tradition. Goldschmidt may be correct when he says: "Die Worte זכר ונקבה, wie oft sie in unserem Buche vorkommen, fehlen in der einen oder anderen Recension, und schon dies beweist, dass sie erst später eingeschoben wurden" (1894: 86). The spelling out of the permutations of אמש and their assignment to male and female is very patchily attested in the Mss and certainly looks like scribal expansion. Ms P adds them in the margin to §§ 33–34 but classified as "interpretation" (פי׳) – in contrast to its marginal reading in § 6 which is classified as a real variant (סא׳). § 35, from which the permutations may be drawn, is not present in the Short Recension. The reading ופרי בטן in the Short Recension of § 33 is clearly out of harmony with the context and has no support in the other recensions. It has presumably arisen out of the frequency of this expression in the Hebrew Bible.

We come now to the problem of the status of §§ 32–34 as a whole in the earlier stages of the SY tradition. The problem is that the parallel constructions in §§ 41 and 52 are not present in the Short Recension and Dunash regards 32–34 as interpolated commentary material.[80] In the Saadyan Recension §§ 32–35 are assigned in a block to its chapter 5:1–3. Chapters 5–8 in this recension are not organised on the same principle as the first four chapters but consist mainly of material lifted in complete blocks from the Long Recension; see Weinstock 1981: 33–34. Saadya seems to have regarded this as supplementary material since he provides no translation of it and only a cursory commentary; significant parts receive no

[80] Vajda-Fenton 2002: 110, Hebrew text 238, Arabic text in Vajda 1954: 52.

commentary at all.[81] We might also note some minor disturbance in the paragraph order at this point in the Short Recension: 32, 34, 33 in Mss KSIR (and Paris 763, 2a). It is, perhaps, significant that Dan struggles to reconcile the concept of creation in these paragraphs with that which elsewhere he describes as SY's "systematic, scientific approach" (1993: 26–27). There is less of a clash with §§ 1–16 and 20 if we assume, firstly, that the active role of the letters Aleph, Mem, Shin in creation belongs to a later stage of the textual tradition – as we have argued in the notes to § 19, and secondly, that in §§ 32–34 (and § 31) וחתם is the original reading and not וצר. Finally, we might note that §§ 28–30, though possibly not part of the earlier text, do not attribute a direct role in creation to the actual letters but refer only to what they symbolise – אויר/רוח ומים ואש. We will need to return to this problem when we come to consider §§ 41 and 52. Meanwhile, §§ 32–34 must be assigned to the earliest recoverable stage of the SY text (albeit with the reading וחתם) because they are attested in all three recensions. However, in deference to Dunash and the implication of their position in the Saadyan Recension I enclose them in square brackets in Appendix III to indicate some doubt as to their presence in the earlier form of the text.[82]

Sefer Yeṣira § 35

A

כאיזה צד צרפן אמש אשם מאש משא שמא שאם שמים אש אויר רוח ארץ מים ראשו שלאדם אש בטנו מים לבו רוח.

How did he combine them? – AMŠ, AŠM, MAŠ, MŠA, ŠMA, ŠAM – heaven/fire, air/spirit, earth/water. Man's head is fire, his belly water, his heart spirit (or air).[83]

B^1B^2GDH collated to A:
לבו רוח בטנו מים [בטנו מים לבו רוח B^1B^2DH.

C

כאזה צד צרפן אמש אשם מאש שמא שאם. שמים אש אויר רוח ארץ מים. ראשו שלאנש אש לבו רוח בטנו מים.

How did he combine them? – AMŠ, AŠM, MAŠ, ŠMA, ŠAM – heaven/fire, air/spirit, earth/water. Man's head is fire, his heart spirit (or air), his belly water.

ZE collated to C:
שלאדם [שלאנש ZE. משא add ZE. אשם]

[81] Ben-Shammai 1988: 7 observes that Saadya and Dunash make similar comments on the secondary nature of this material at the same points in their commentaries since Saadya's remarks about his procedure in dealing with the second half of SY precisely precedes his chapter five.

[82] It may be significant, as Liebes points out (2000: 18–19), that only in the case of אמש does SY see an integral relationship between the phonetic character of the letters and the realities they represent. No such connection is made for the other two groups of letters. Hence §§ 41 and 52 could have been created by analogy from §§ 32–34.

[83] For the problems created by the (later?) attempt to resolve the ambiguity of רוח in SY by introducing the word אויר see the notes to § 25.

Notes on the text of § 35

This paragraph is not present in the Short Recension – though Mss K and R have most of its material distributed over §§ 32–34 while most Short Recension Mss have part of it in § 32. As we have seen, in the Saadyan Recension it is assigned, along with §§ 32–34, to the supplementary material which begins Saadya's chapter five. It is commented on by Dunash though not expressly cited (Vajda-Fenton 2002: 110). Similarly, Donnolo and Judah ben Barzillai do not expressly cite it but their commentaries attempt the same task as § 35, namely, to systematize and sum up the preceding paragraphs.[84] When a text is not expressly cited by the commentators it is often difficult to discern what they had before them. I would judge that Dunash knew § 35 more or less as we have it but that Donnolo and Judah did not. It seems, then, that this paragraph cannot have been present in the earliest recoverable form of SY.[85] It is an attempt to complete the expansion of the text which can be seen beginning in some Short Recension Mss, especially K and R. The substitution of לבו for the rarer and ambiguous גויה of §§ 30 and 32 is another sign of the later date of § 35.

The only variant reading of interest is Ms C's אנש for the אדם of all our other witnesses. Was it chosen because of its similarity to the word אש alongside it or have all the other texts corrected to the proper Hebrew word? We cannot know.

Mss B[1] G and H have the permutations of the letters אמש in a different order from that in the other Mss. If we take the order of the combinations in Ms A as 123456, then B[1]H have them in the order 123645, G in the order 12465. The weight of evidence suggests that the correct order of words at the end of the paragraph is לבו רוח בטנו מים. Ms C obviously omitted the combination משא in error.

Sefer Yeṣira § 36

A

שלוש אימות אמש נוצר עם אלף רוח אויר רוויה וגיויה וחוק ולשון.
נוצר עם מם ארץ קור ובטן וכף זכות.
נוצר עם שין שמים וחום וראש וכף חובה זה אמש. חסלת.

Three primary letters: Alef, Mem, Shin. There was formed with Alef: spirit, air, humidity, the chest, law, and the tongue (or language). There was formed with Mem: earth,

C

נוצר עם אלף [אילו רוח אויר רויה וגויה וחוק] לשון.
נוצר עם מם אילו [מים ארץ קור ובטן וכף] זכות.
נוצר עם שין אלו אש שמים חן]ום וראש וכף חובה]

There was formed with Alef these: spirit, air, humidity, the chest, and the law of language. There was formed with Mem these: water, earth, cold, the belly, and the scale of acquit-

[84] Castelli 1880: 48–50, Halberstam 1885: 226–228.
[85] So also Goldschmidt 1894: 87 and Allony 1972: 84.

cold, the belly, and the scale of acquittal. There was formed with Shin: heaven, heat, the head, and the scale of guilt. This is Alef, Mem, Shin. The end.

tal. There was formed with Shin these: fire, heaven, heat, the head, and the scale of guilt.

D

שלש אמות אמש נוצר עם מם ארץ קור ובטן וכף זכות.
נוצר עם אלף רוח אויר רויה וחק בלשון.
נוצר עם שין שמים וחום וראש וכף חובה זה אמש.

B¹B²GH collated to A:
נוצר 1^{0-3^0}] נצור B¹. וחוק לשון [וחוק ולשון B¹.

Z

נוצר עם אלף אילו רוח אויר רויה וגויה וחוק לשון.
נוצר עם מים אילו מַיִם ארץ קור ובטן וכף חובה.
נוצר עם שין אילו אש שמים חום וכף זכות.

E = C as restored

Notes on the text of § 36

This paragraph, along with the similarly constructed §§ 44 and 54, is not present in the Short Recension.[86] In the Saadyan Recension these three paragraphs are in a block together at the beginning of Saadya's chapter eight where there are no paragraph divisions and the text runs smoothly through all twenty-two letters, using this framework. Weinstock argues that this was the original arrangement of this material and only later was it split up and distributed in the Long Recension over the chapters dealing with the three separate groups of letters. Its place at, or near, the end of these chapters, witnesses for him to its supplementary character (1981: 44).[87] § 36 as it stands adds nothing new to the content of SY. It simply fits §§ 28–35 into a new framework and then fuses the end of § 23 into them. However, the process has reached different levels of achievement in the various Mss and none manages a harmonious balance. In Ms A six items are created by the letter Aleph but only four by the other letters. Ms C appears to have five items created by each letter, while Z has five created with Aleph and Mem but only four with Shin. Ms D manages a consistent four items created with each letter but its sentences are in a different order from the other Mss. This textual fluidity is another reason for concluding with Weinstock that this is not core SY material. Moreover, we have already seen that the notion that the letters Aleph, Mem, Shin had an active role in creation is only loosely embedded in the text of this part of SY.

[86] Donnolo (Castelli 1880: 50) has a very expanded form of this paragraph, while Dunash and Judah ben Barzillai do not seem to have had it before them.

[87] Goldschmidt 1894: 87 also regards this paragraph, like the preceding one, as having come into the text of SY from a commentary.

The introductory formula שלוש אימות אמש in the Long Recension is due to the placing of this paragraph in chapter three of that recension which, if Weinstock is correct, will be subsequent to the creation of the Saadyan Recension. See the parallel rubrics in §§ 44 and 54.

Ms B^{l} has נצור (the Niphal perfect of the root צור) while the other Mss have נוצר (from the root יצר). In § 44 B^{l} goes with the other Mss and has נוצר but deviates again in § 54.

וחוק ולשון in Ms A seems a clear error but וחוק לשון in B^{l} and the Saadyan text does not seem a much better attempt to quarry § 23. Ms D's וחק בלשון looks like an attempt to make more sense out of the original error. Perhaps an ancestor of all these Mss reversed these two words in error when copying from § 23.

זה אמש in the Long Recension rounds off the chapter. It is further reinforced by A's חסלת which is not in the other manuscripts. These sorts of additions obviously belong to the editorial work which produced our present recensions.

Sefer Yeṣira § 37

C

(37a) שבע כפולות בגד כפרת, בגד [כפ]רת. יסודן חיים ושלום וחכמה ועושר חן זר[ע וממשלה] ועבדות.
(37b) שבע כפולות בגד כפרת משתמשות בשתי לשונות שהן כפולות בב גג דד ככ פפ רר תת: כנגד רך תבנית גיבור חלש והן תמורות. תמורת חיים מוות תמורת שלום רע תמורת חכמה אולת תמורת עושר עוני תמורת זרע שממה תמורת חן כאור תמורת ממשלה עבדות

A

שבע כפולות בגד כפרת יסודן חיים ושלום וחכמה ועושר זרע וחן וממשלה ומתנהגות בשתי לשונות שהם כפולות שלתמורות בית בית גימל גימל דל דל כף כף פה פה ריש ריש תיו תיו כנגד רך וקשה תבנית גיבור כנגד חלש והן תמורות: תמורת חיים מוות, תמורת שלום רע[1], תמורת חכמה איולת, תמורת עושר עוני, תמורת זרע שממה, תמורת חן כיעור, תמורת ממשלה עבדות

[1] נא׳ מלחמה A^{mg}.

K

שבע כפולות בגד כפרת ומתנהגות בשתי לשונות. יסודן. חיים ושלום חכמה ועושר וזרע וחן וממשלה ומתנהגות בשתי לשונות. בית בית גימל גימל דל דל כף כף פי פי רש רש תו תו דגש ורפי רק וקשה תבנית גיבור וחלש. וכפולות שהם תמורות. תמורת חיים מות, תמורת שלום רע, תמורת חכמה אולת, תמורת עושר עוני, תמורת זרע שממה, תמורת חן כיעור, תמורת ממשלה עבדות.

(37a) Seven double letters: Bet, Gimel, Dalet; Kaph, Pe, Resh, Taw; Bet, Gimel, Dalet; Kaph, Pe, Resh, Taw. Their basis is life and peace, wisdom, wealth, beauty, prosperity, mastery and slavery. (37b) Seven double letters: Bet, Gimel, Dalet; Kaph, Pe, Resh, Taw. They are pro-

Seven double letters: Bet, Gimel, Dalet; Kaph, Pe, Resh, Taw. Their basis is life and peace, wisdom, wealth, prosperity, beauty and mastery. They are pronounced with the tongue in two different positions, for they represent two categories of opposites: Bet/Vet,

Seven double letters: Bet, Gimel, Dalet; Kaph, Pe, Resh, Taw. They are pronounced with the tongue in two different positions. Their basis is life and peace, wisdom, wealth, prosperity, beauty and mastery. They are pronounced with the tongue in two different positions:

Bet/Vet, Gimel/Ghimel, Dalet/ Dhalet, Kaph/Khaph, Pe/Fe, Resh/Rhesh, Taw/ Thaw – Daghesh and Raphe, soft and hard, a paradigm of strong and weak. They are double letters because they are opposites. The opposite of life is death; the opposite of peace is evil; the opposite of wisdom is folly; the opposite of wealth is poverty; the opposite of prosperity is desolation; the opposite of beauty is ugliness; and the opposite of mastery is slavery.

Gimel/Ghimel, Dalet/ Dhalet, Kaph/Khaph, Pe/Fe, Resh/Rhesh, Taw/Thaw, corresponding to soft and hard, a paradigm of strong and weak. They are opposites. The opposite of life is death; the opposite of peace is evil; the opposite of wisdom is folly; the opposite of wealth is poverty; the opposite of prosperity is desolation; the opposite of beauty is ugliness; and the opposite of mastery is slavery.

nounced with the tongue in two different positions, for they are double (letters): Bet/ Vet, Gimel/Ghimel, Dalet/ Dhalet, Kaph/Khaph, Pe/Fe, Resh/Rhesh, Taw/Thaw, corresponding to soft [and hard], a paradigm of strong [and] weak. They are opposites. The opposite of life is death; the opposite of peace is evil; the opposite of wisdom is folly; the opposite of wealth is poverty; the opposite of prosperity is desolation; the opposite of beauty is ugliness; and the opposite of mastery is slavery.

D

שבע כפולות בגד כפרת יסודן חיים ושלום חכמה ועושר וזרע וחן וממשלה ומתנהגות בשתי לשונות שהן כפולות של תמורות. בב.גג.דד.ככ.פפ.רר.תת. כנגד רך וקשה תבנית גבור וחלש הן תמורות. תמורות חיים מות, תמורת עושר עוני, תמורת חכמה אולת, תמורת שלום מלחמה, תמורת זרע שממה, תמורת חן כיעור, תמורת ממשלה עבדות.

Z

שבע כפולות בגד כפרת יסודן חיים ושלום חכמה ועושר זרע חן וממשלה.[Chapter 1:3]
שבע כפולות בגד כפרת משתמשות בשני לשונות בֵּי בֵי גימל גַּמַל דֶּלֶת דָּלֶת כַּף כַּף פֵּי פֵּי רֵישׁ רֵישׁ תָּיו תָּיו:
רך וקשה תבנית גבור וחלש כפולות שהן תמורות תמורת חיים מות תמורת שלום רע תמורת חכמה אולת תמורת עושר עוני תמורת זרע שממה תמורת חן כיאור תמורת ממשלה עבדות, [Chapter 2:2, 3:3]

LMNSFPIQR collated to K:
חן LMNPQ. וזרע וחן] וזרע וחן ומתנהגות בשתי לשונות 2⁰] om LP. דגש ורפי] om LMNFPIQ. רך] רך L...R. וכפולות שהם תמורות והן] תמורות SPIQR. רע] מלחמה SFIR. תמורת חכמה] pr תמורת טוב רע SI.

B^1B^2GH collated to A:
B^1. וסודן] יסודן כנגד B^1B^2GH. וחלש] וחלש B^2. רע] וכפולות שהן והן מלחמה רע B^2.

E collated to Z:
שהן כפולות] add לשונות E. שלתמורות] כי ורך וקשה כנגד רך קשה E. כיאור] כעור E.

Notes on the text of § 37

§ 37 is attested in all our recensions and manuscripts. In the Short and Long Recensions it introduces the chapter which deals with the seven double letters. However, in the Saadyan Recension it is split into two parts (which I have labelled 37a and 37b) and distributed as follows: 37a occurs in all three manuscripts in the first sequential run of the ten *sefirot*, three mothers, seven doubles and twelve simples – ch 1:3 according to Saadya's numbering. Then 37b occurs in Ms Z alone in Saadya's ch 2:2 – after § 24a and before § 38. It is superfluous in this position since § 38 fills the slot required for a paragraph on the seven doubles. Finally, in all three Mss § 37b appears as Saadya's ch 3:3 after § 25, 26, 24b taken as one unit dealing with the three mothers and before §§ 48a and 40, again taken as one unit, filling the twelve simples slot. Weinstock (1981: 35) argues, correctly I think, that although the doublet of § 37b stood in the text Saadya had before him, it is out of place in ch 2:2 and its correct place, as in Mss C and E, is in ch 3:3. Weinstock also uses this example to demonstrate that the Genizah Scroll is independent of and much earlier than the form of the Saadyan Recension on which Saadya based his commentary.

Was § 37 split into two for the purposes of the re-arrangement which characterises the Saadyan Recension or did its editor already find it as two separate paragraphs? There are signs of textual disturbance in the clause (ומתנהגות בשתי לשונות) which links the two halves and the phrase occurs twice in the Short Recension, once in each half of the paragraph. The deletion of its second occurrence in Mss L and P is obviously an attempt to remove the duplication. The longer form of this rubric as we see it in the Long Recension Mss and Mss C and E (as against Z) – ומתנהגות בשתי לשונות שהם כפולות שלתמורות, is split into two in the Short Recension and in Ms Z and the phrase וכפולות שהם תמורות directly precedes the list of the opposites. Mss SPIQR, D, C have a shorter form of this second rubric in the same position, namely, והן תמורות. It is almost impossible to reconstruct from these variants an earlier form of SY from which they could all have descended. The variants could either be the result of an attempt to blend together two originally separate paragraphs or reflect the impact of the separation into two paragraphs as in the Saadyan Recension.

The evidence of Dunash ben Tamim's commentary may be decisive in helping us to judge between these two alternatives. Both in the Genizah fragment (Vajda 1954: 53) and in the Hebrew translation of Moses ben Joseph (Vajda-Fenton 2002: 239), a short form of § 37 (more or less equivalent to § 37a) is cited as the lemma:

שבע כפולות בגד כפרת מתנהגות בשתי לשונות חיים ושלום וחכמה ועושר חן זרע ממשלה בשתי לשונות בי בי גימל גימל דלת דלת כף כף פי פי ריש ריש תיו תיו רך וקשה גיבור וחלש.[88]

[88] § 37 is missing in the truncated version of Dunash's commentary edited by Grossberg 1902: 61.

Then the content of § 37b follows but clearly labelled as commentary (תפסיר, פירוש). This suggests that § 37b may have arisen as commentary to § 37a and that the variants we have been considering arose as the commentary was integrated into the base text. If so, the division into two halves in the Saadyan Recension does take us back to an earlier stage of the text than the Short and Long Recensions. § 37 will then have reached its present form by a similar process to § 17. It may be significant that Judah ben Barzillai cites § 37 as far as תמורת שלום רע and then continues (Halberstam 228–229): ואית דגרסי תמורת חכמה איולת, תמורת עושר עוני, תמורת זרע שממה, תמורת חן כיעור, תמורת ממשלה עבדות. This would take us back to a stage not long before the emergence of the final form of the Short and Long Recensions. I conclude, then, that the text of SY § 37 as cited in the Genizah fragment of Dunash's commentary might represent the earliest recoverable stage of this part of the SY tradition. Since, however, § 37b is present in all our Mss I include it within square brackets in my attempted restoration of the core text of SY.

Ms C has the usual crop of errors: there is a doublet of בגד כפרת at the beginning, though this might be quite deliberate – representing the "doubling of these letters", since the same doublet recurs at the beginning of the next paragraph; עבדות is added after ממשלה in 37a through the influence of 37b, and וקשה has been omitted after רך. The form of § 37b in chapter 3:3 of Ms Z is almost identical to that in ch 2:2 except that there is less vocalisation and Taw is spelt תו.

We can now observe in the textual tradition of § 37 the same process of updating and improvement which we saw in § 17b. Note, for example, how in Mss KSR רך וקשה is glossed by דגש ורפי. The replacement of מתנהגות by משתמשות in the Saadyan Recension may be part of this process; משתמשות occurs elsewhere in SY only in § 17b which we have found good reason to assign to a very late stage in the emergence of the SY tradition.[89] Ms A's insertion of כנגד between גיבור and חלש over against all the other Mss strengthens the sense of contrast. Ms A's marginal variant מלחמה for רע is another improvement. "Evil" does not seem a natural opposite to "peace" – Isa 45:7 is probably behind the original choice of words. But note the text of IQIsa[a]! This marginal variant and its incorporation into Ms B[1] as a gloss is an object lesson in how textual variants arise. It ends up in Mss DSFIR completely replacing רע.

Sefer Yeṣira § 38

K	A	C
שבע כפולות בגד כפרת כנגד שבע קצוות מקום קצות ומקום קדוש מקום מוכן	שבע כפולות בגד כפרת שבע ולא שש שבע ולא שמונה מכוון שש צלעות	שבע כפולות בגד כפרת בגד כפרת שבע ולא שש שבע ולא שמונה שש צלעות

[89] Donnolo combines both readings and then adds ונאמרות for good measure (Castelli 1880: 51).

לששה סדרים והיכל קדוש מכוון באמצע ברוך כבוד יי׳ ממקמו. והוא מקומו שלעולמו ואין עלמו שלא מקמו.

Seven double letters: Bet, Gimel, Dalet; Kaph, Pe, Resh, Taw; Bet, Gimel, Dalet; Kaph, Pe, Resh, Taw. Seven and not six, seven and not eight – six directions for the six sides (of a cube), and the Holy Temple set in the middle. *Blessed be the glory of the Lord from his place* (Ezek 3:12). He is the place of his world, but his world is not his place.

Z

שבע כפולות בגד כפרת שבע ולא שש שבע ולא שמונה שש צלעות לששה סדרים והיכל קדוש מכוון באמצע ברוך יי׳ ממקומו והוא מקומו שלעולם ואין עולמו מקמו.

E collated to Z:
add ברוך E. ושש]ה לשש] כבוד E.

לששה סדרים והיכל קדוש מכון באמצע ברוך כבוד יי׳ ממקומו הוא מקומו של עולמו ואין עולמו מקומו והוא נושא את כולן.

Seven double letters: Bet, Gimel, Dalet; Kaph, Pe, Resh, Taw. Seven and not six, seven and not eight – six directions corresponding to the six sides (of a cube), and the Holy Temple set in the middle. *Blessed be the glory of the Lord from his place* (Ezek 3:12). He is the place of his world, but his world is not his place. And he supports them all.

D

שבע כפולות שבע ולא שש שבע ולא שמונה שש קצות לשש דרכים. והיכל הקדש מכוון באמצע ברוך כבוד יי ממקומו הוא מקומו של עולם שלו ואין עולמו מקומו והוא נושא את כלם.

B¹B²G collated to A:
om B¹. והוא נושא את כולן]

במקום אחת, שתים קצוות מעלה, שלש קצוות מטה, ארבע קצוות מזרח, חמש קצוות מערב, שש קצוות צפון, שבע קצוות עדי עד והיכל הקודש מכוון באמצע והוא נושא את כולם.

Seven double letters: Bet, Gimel, Dalet; Kaph, Pe, Resh, Taw. Seven edges: a place of edges and a holy place; a place set within a place – one; two – the upper edge, three – the lower edge, four – the eastern edge, five – the western edge, six – the northern edge, seven, the eternal edge, and the holy temple set in the middle and it supports them all.

FI collated to K:
מהם שש קצוות [מקום קצות F. במקומו [כולם FI. כול בעולם I, כול העולם כלו F.

L

שבע כפולות בגד כפרת כנגד שבע קצוות. מקום שש קצוות מעלה ומטה מזרח מערב צפון דרום והיכל הקדש מכוון באמצע והוא נושא את כולם

MNPQ collated to L:
מכוון MNQ. מהן [מקום שבאמצע Q. והוא [באמצע om Q.

S

שבע כפולות בגד כפרת. כנגד שש קצות מקום ומקום הקדש מכוון באמצע. אחת קצות מעלה, שתים קצות מטה, שלש קצות מזרח, ארבע קצות מערב, חמש קצות צפון, שש קצות דרום. והקצה השביעי

R

שבע כפולות בגד כפרת. כנגד שש קצוות ומרום וקדוש מוכן במקומו אחת. שתים קצוות מעלה, שלש קצוות מטה, ארבע קצוות מזרח, חמש קצוות מערב, שש קצוות צפון, שבע

קצוות עדי עד. והיכל הקדש מכוון באמצע והוא נושא את כלן	הוא קצה עדי עד. והיכל הקדש המכוון באמצע והוא נושא את כולם.

Notes on the text of § 38[90]

§ 38 is present in all three recensions; it is omitted (along with § 39) in Ms H, presumably by parablepsis. However, the Long and Saadyan Recensions offer a very different text from the Short Recension Mss and these, in turn, are so divergent that setting up a single textual apparatus for them is impossible. Donnolo cites a text which is almost identical with that of Ms A (and hence of most Long Recension Mss) except that he reads צדדים for סדרים – a helpful clarification (Castelli 1880: 52). Dunash has a relatively simple text very close to that of Mss MNQ (L):

שבע כפולות בגד כפרת כנגד שבע קצוות מהם שש קצוות מטה מעלה מזרח ומערב צפון ודרום והיכל הקדש מוכן באמצע והוא נושא את כולן.[91]

Judah ben Barzillai first cites this paragraph in a text identical with that of Dunash except for the reversal of מטה and מעלה (Halberstam 1885: 120) but then, later on, he cites it in a text close to that of Mss S and R, while offering the Long Recension version as an alternative reading (*ibid.* 231).

Behind the various Short Recension readings it is possible to discern a shorter text (more or less equivalent to the form in Mss MNQ and cited by Dunash and Judah) which has then been expanded in Mss KFISR. Ms Q has the shortest text of all for it simplifies the end of the paragraph making clear that it is the Temple which supports them all – והיכל הקדש שבאמצע נושא את כולן. If we assume that מקום in Ms L is an error for מהם then it too supports this short version of the text.

The Long Recension form of the paragraph is modelled on §§ 4 and 46, the latter of which is not present in the Short Recension. Since there is no parallel form for the "three mothers" chapter, i.e. "three and not four, three and not two" it is possible that the Long Recension text both here and in § 46 was built up from the model of § 4. The biblical reference, as so often in SY is clearly intrusive and brought in by the reference to the Temple, while the rabbinic saying (הוא מקומו של עולמו ואין עולמו מקומו)[92] may have been added, as S. Pines suggests "because it contradicts the assertion in the preceding passage that God is localised in one particular place" (1989: 86, n.183).[93] והוא נושא את כולם is not present in the Saadyan Recension

[90] For an exposition of this paragraph and its importance in the overall scheme of SY see Hayman 1986.

[91] Vajda 1954: 53.

[92] See Urbach 1979: 68.

[93] See also Liebes 2000: 194–95 who tries to maintain the originality of the Long Recension version of this paragraph but without taking into account the full range of textual evidence.

or Ms B[1] in the Long Recension and that naturally places a question mark over its place in the earlier form of the text. If we strip out these evident expansions we arrive at an even shorter text than in Mss LMNQ, Dunash and Judah:

שבע כפולות בגד כפרת שש צלעות לששה סדרים והיכל קדוש מוכן באמצע

This could have been simply expanded by spelling out what the six directions were following §§ 7, 15 or 47, giving us the Short Recension text. However, what the precise wording of such a core text might have been is impossible to reconstruct. Was it שש צלעות לששה סדרים or simply שבע קצוות? שש קצוות is present in all recensions in § 15 as a description of the directions of space whereas ששה סדרים in § 47 is confined, as here, to the Long and Saadyan Recensions. Could סדרים have been brought in to provide a subtle allusion to the six *sedarim* of the Mishnah? צלעות occurs in SY only here in the Long and Saadyan Recensions. Tentatively I reconstruct a possible earliest form of § 38 as follows: שבע כפולות בגד כפרת שש קצוות והיכל קדוש מוכן באמצע (seven double letters, Bet, Gimel, Dalet; Kaph, Pe, Resh, Taw – the six edges (of the universe) and the Holy Temple set in the middle). The clause והוא נושא את כולם is very congruent with the overall teaching of SY and is certainly present in the majority of witnesses. But I cannot account for its absence in the Saadyan Recension or Ms B[1]. I have added it in brackets to my hypothetical reconstruction of the earliest recoverable text of SY. Goldschmidt (1894: 60) makes a similar attempt to reconstruct the original form of this paragraph; his reconstruction is close to the text found in Mss (L)MNQ.

שלא in Ms C is an aural error for שלו.

Sefer Yeṣira § 39

K

שבע כפולות בגד כפרת.
חקקן, וחצבן, צרפן, וצר בהן
כוכבים בעולם, וימים בשנה,
ושערים בנפש, שבעה שבעה.

Seven double letters: Bet, Gimel, Dalet; Kaph, Pe, Resh, Taw. He carved and hewed them, he combined them, and formed with them the planets in the universe, the days in the year, and the apertures in mankind, by sevens.

A

שבע כפולות בגד כפרת
חקקן וחצבן צרפן שקלן
והמירן וצר בהן כוכבים
בעולם וימים בשנה ושערים
בנפש שבעה שבעה

Seven double letters: Bet, Gimel, Dalet; Kaph, Pe, Resh, Taw. He carved and hewed them, he combined them, weighed them and exchanged them, and he formed with them the planets in the universe, the days in the year, and the apertures in mankind, by sevens.

C

שבע כפולות בגד כפרת.
חקקן חצבן [צ]רפן שקלן
והימירן וצר בהן כוכבים
ימים ושערים.

Seven double letters: Bet, Gimel, Dalet; Kaph, Pe, Resh, Taw. He carved them, hewed them, combined them, weighed them and exchanged them, and he formed with them the planets, the days, and the apertures.

LMNSFPIQR collated to K:
שבעה בעולם [בעולם הידועים F. שבעה שבעה] om LMNFPIQ.

B^1B^2G collated to A:
שקלן [צרפן שקלן והמירן [חקקן...וצר D. חקקן וצרפן שקלן וחצבן חקקן והעמידן וצר G. צרפן] om B^1.

ZE = C

Notes on the text of § 39

§ 39 in all recensions unequivocally states that the seven double letters had a role in the process of creation. For the textual uncertainty in the earlier part of SY on the role of the letters see the notes to §§ 19 and 31. Compared to § 38 the textual problems of § 39 are relatively simple. A shorter text in the Saadyan version seems to have been expanded by the addition of בעולם, בשנה, and בנפש in all other Mss. Then the Long Recension and three Mss of the Short Recension have added שבעה שבעה at the end. Finally, it looks as though the list of verbs depicting God's creative activity has been augmented in the course of time: the Short Recension has four verbs (חקקן חצבן צרפן צר), over against six in the Long and Saadyan Recensions (חקקן חצבן צרפן שקלן המירן צר) while Dunash has just three verbs (חקקן חצבן צר)[94]. Judah ben Barzillai has the four verbs of the Short Recension (Halberstam 1885: 239) and Donnolo has the six verbs of the Long Recension (Castelli 1880: 52). There are comparable variations in the number of these verbs in § 49. If these minor additions were present in the text before the reviser who produced the Saadyan Recension I can think of no reason why he should omit them. Adding them reinforces the role of the letters in the three dimensions of reality which structure this part of SY.

Sefer Yeṣira § 40

C	A	K
כאיזה צד צרפן שתי אבנים בונות שני בתים שלוש בונות ששה בתים ארבע בונות עשרים וארבע בתים חמש בונות מאה ועשרים בתים שש בונות שבע מאות ועשרים בתים. שבע בונות חמשת אלפים וארבעים בתים מיכן והלך צוד וחשב משאין יכול לדבר ומשעין יכולה לראות ומשאוזן יכולה לשמוע	כאיזה צד צרפן שתי אבנים בונות שני בתים שלוש בונות ששה בתים, ארבע בונות עשרים וארבע בתים, חמש בונות מאה ועשרים בתים שש בונות שבע מאות ועשרים בתים, שבע בונות חמשת אלפים וארבעים בתים. מיכאן ואילך צא וחשוב מה שאין [68b] הפה יכולה לדבר ומה שאין העין	כאי זה צד צרפן. שני אבנים בונות שני בתים, שלש בונות ששה בתים, ארבע בונות עשרים וארבע בתים, חמש בונות מאה ועשרים בתים, שש בונות שבע מאות ועשרים בתים, שבע בונות חמשת אלפים וארבעים. מיכן ואילך צא וחשב מה שאין הפה יכול לדבר ומה שאין האוזן יכולה לשמוע.

[94] Vajda 1954: 54, Vajda-Fenton 2002: 239. However, the beginning of § 40 presupposes the presence of the verb צרפן in § 39.

יכולה לראות ומה שאין
האוזן יכולה לשמוע.

How did he combine them? – two stones build two houses; three build six; four build twenty-four; five build one hundred and twenty; six build seven hundred and twenty; seven build five thousand and forty. From here on go out and ponder what the mouth cannot speak, and what the ear cannot hear.

How did he combine them? – two stones build two houses; three build six houses; four build twenty-four houses; five build one hundred and twenty houses; six build seven hundred and twenty houses; seven build five thousand and forty houses. From here on go out and ponder what the mouth cannot speak, and what the eye cannot see, and what the ear cannot hear.

How did he combine them? – two stones build two houses; three build six houses; four build twenty-four houses; five build one hundred and twenty houses; six build seven hundred and twenty houses; seven build five thousand and forty houses. From here on go out[95] and ponder what [the mouth] cannot speak, and what the eye [cannot] see, and what the ear [cannot] hear.

D

כיצד צרפן שתי אבנים
בונות שני בתים, שלוש
בונות ששה בתים, ארבע
בונות עשרים וארבע בתים,
חמש בונות מאה ועשרים
בתים שש בונות שבע מאות
ועשרים בתים שבע בונות
חמשת אלפים וארבעים
בתים. מכאן צא וחשוב מה
שאין הפה יכול לדבר ואין
האזן יכולה לשמוע.

E

כיצד צרפן שתי אבנים בונות
שני בתים שלש בונות ששה
בתים ארבע בונות עשרים
וארבע בתים חמש בונות מאה
ועשרים בתים שש בונות שבע
מאות ועשרים בתים שבע
בונות חמשת אלפים וארבעים
בתים. מכאן ואילך צא וחשוב
מה שאין הפה יכולה לדבר
ומה שאין העין יכולה לראות
ומה שאין אוזן יכולה לשמוע.

LMNSFPIQR collated to K:
כאי..צרפן] om LMNPQ.
אבנים] אותיות MN.
וארבעים] add בתים L...R.

B^1B^2GH collated to A:
ומה שאין העין יכולה
לראות] om B^2.

Z collated to E:
ומה שאין העין יכולה לראות]
om Z.

Notes on the text of § 40

This paragraph, like the preceding one, is present in all our recensions and Mss. Its rather repetitive wording has given rise to many errors by parablepsis in the Mss. They are recorded in Gruenwald's apparatus. Since both Mss C and Z suffer in this way I have printed the text of E which has preserved the Saadyan version intact. There are very few real variants. Ms Q adds אבנים after the numerals 3–7 while

[95] צוד must be an error for צא.

Ms G omits most occurrences of both בתים and בונות. The only substantial variant comes at the end of the paragraph. All texts attest מה שאין הפה יכול לדבר and מה שאין העין יכולה לראות but שאין האוזן יכולה לשמוע appears only in AB^{1}GH C and E. So it is absent in Mss from all three Recensions and not in the Short Recension at all. It could, of course, have been omitted by parablepsis but it is more likely to have come in under the influence of Isa 64:3. The saying is often cited in Jewish texts, most often in the "mouth" and "ear" version as in most Mss here.[96]. A version with "eye" and "mouth" occurs in III Enoch § 39 and in the Visions of Ezekiel, l.51 (Gruenwald 1972: 121).[97]

Mss M and N rather crassly substitute the literal אותיות for the metaphorical אבנים. There are the usual crop of scribal errors in the text of Ms C.

Sefer Yeṣira § 41

C	A
1 המליך את בית וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו שבתי בעלם ושבת בשנה ופה בנפש	1 המליך את בית וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו שבתי בעולם ושבת בשנה ופה בנפש.
2 המליך את גימל וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו צדק בעלם ואחד בשבת ועין ימין בנפש.	2 המליך את גימל וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו צדק בעולם ואחד בשבת בשנה ועין ימין בנפש.
3 המליך את דל וקשר לו כתר וצר בו מאדים בעלם ושני בשבת בשנה ועין שמאל בנפש	3 המליך את דל וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו מאדים בעולם ושיני בשבת בשנה ועין שמאול בנפש.
4 המליך את כף וקשר לו כתר וצר בו חמה בעלם ושלשי בשבת בשנה ואף ימין בנפש	4 המליך את כף וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו חמה בעולם ושלישי בשבת בשנה ואף ימין בנפש.
5 המליך את פה וקשר לו כתר וצר בו נוגה בעלם ורביעי בשבת בשנה ואף שמאל בנפש	5 המליך את פה וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו נוגה בעולם ורביעי בשבת בשנה ואף שמאול בנפש.
6 המליך את ראש וקשר לו כתר וצר בו כוכב חמה בעלם וחמשי בשבת בשנה ואוזן ימין בנפש	6 המליך את ריש וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו כוכב חמה בעולם וחמישי בשבת בשנה ואוזן ימין בנפש.
7 המליך את תיו וקשר לו כתר וצר בו לבנה בעלם וששי בשבת בשנה ואוזן שמאל בנפש	7 המליך את תיו וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו לבנה בעולם וששי בשבת בשנה ואוזן שמאל בנפש.

[96] See Shiur Qoma § 949 and for the parallels here and elsewhere between SY and SQ Cohen 1983: 180–181 and 208, n. 35, Sifre Numbers § 102 (Horovitz 1966: 100), *b. Shab* 20b, *b. RH* 27a. Cohen (*ibid.* 181) makes a serious methodological error when he seeks to draw a parallel between SY § 4 and SQ. The reading which interests him ומידתו עשר שאין להן סוף is found only in the printed editions of SY (Long Recension) and in Mss B^{1}B^{2}. It is not present in any other of our textual witnesses. It is a tendentious kabbalistic alteration; see the notes to § 4.

[97] Halperin 1988: 275f regards the presence of the "eye" clause as an indication of the late date of the Visions of Ezekiel.

(1) He made Bet rule, and bound to it a crown, and combined one with another, and formed with it Saturn in the universe, the sabbath in the year, and the mouth in mankind.
(2) He made Gimel rule, and bound to it a crown, and combined one with another, and formed with it Jupiter in the universe, the first day of the week in the year, and the right eye in mankind.
(3) He made Dalet rule, and bound to it a crown, and combined with another, and formed with it Mars in the universe, the second day of the week in the year, and the left eye in mankind.
(4) He made Kaf rule, and bound to it a crown, and combined one with another, and formed with it the Sun in the universe, the third day of the week in the year, and the right nostril in mankind.
(5) He made Pe rule, and bound to it a crown, and combined one with another, and formed with it Venus in the universe, the fourth day of the week in the year, and the left nostril in mankind.
(6) He made Resh rule, and bound to it a crown, and combined one with another, and formed with it Mercury in the universe, the fifth day of the week in the year, and the right ear in mankind.
(7) He made Taw rule, and bound to it a crown, and combined one with another, and formed with it the Moon in the universe, the sixth day of the week in the year, and the left ear in mankind.

(1) He made Bet rule, and bound to it a crown, and combined one with another, and formed with it Saturn in the universe, the sabbath in the year, and the mouth in mankind.
(2) He made Gimel rule, and bound to it a crown, and combined one with another, and formed with it Jupiter in the universe, the first day of the week [in the year], and the right eye in mankind.
(3) He made Dalet rule, and bound to it a crown, and formed with it Mars in the universe, the second day of the week in the year, and the left eye in mankind.
(4) He made Kaf rule, and bound to it a crown, and formed with it the Sun in the universe, the third day of the week in the year, and the right nostril in mankind.
(5) He made Pe rule, and bound to it a crown, and formed with it Venus in the universe, the fourth day of the week in the year, and the left nostril in mankind.
(6) He made the head [Resh] rule, and bound to it a crown, and formed with it Mercury in the universe, the fifth day of the week in the year, and the right ear in mankind.
(7) He made Taw rule, and bound to it a crown, and formed with it the Moon in the universe, the sixth day of the week in the year, and the left ear in mankind.

D

1 המליך את בית וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו שבתי בעולם ושבת בשנה ופה בנפש.
2 המליך את ג׳ וקשר לו כתר וצר לו כתר בעולם. ואחד בשבת בשנה ועין ימין בנפש.
3 המליך את ד׳ וקשר לו כתר וצר בו מאדים בעולם ושני בשבת בשנה ועין שמאל בנפש.
4 המליך את כ׳ וקשר לו כתר וצר בו חמה בעולם ושלישי בשבת בשנה ואזן ימין בנפש.

Z

1 המליך את בית וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו שבתי בעלם ושבת בשנה ופה בנפש.
2 המליך את גימל וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו צדק בעלם ואחד בשבת בשנה ועין ימין בנפש.
3 המליך את דל וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו מאדים בעלם ושיני בשבת בשנה ועין שמאל בנפש.
4 המליך את כף וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו חמה בעלם ושלשי בשבת בשנה ואף ימין בנפש.

5 המליך את פה וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו נוגה בעלם ורביעי בשבת בשנה ואף שמאל בנפש.	5 המליך את פ׳ וצר בו נוגה בעולם ורביעי בשבת בשנה ואזן שמאול בנפש.
6 המליך את ריש וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו כוכב חמה בעלם וחמשי בשבת בשנה ואוזן ימין בנפש.	6 המליך את ריש וצר בו כוכב בעולם וחמישי בשבת בשנה ואף ימין בנפש.
7 המליך את תיו וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו לבנה בעלם וששי בשבת בשנה ואוזן שמאל בנפש.	7 המליך את תיו וצר בו לבנה בעולם ששי בשבת בשנה ואף שמאל בנפש.
E collated to Z: וצרפן זה עם זה 2–7] om E.	B^1B^2GH = A

Notes on the text of § 41

We have already noted in connection with the similarly structured §§ 32–34 that § 41 is not present in the Short Recension. Neither is § 52 which again has the same structure. At this point too the paragraph order in the Mss diverges. Most Mss of the Long Recension follow the order 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, though B^2 has 39, 43a, 40, 41, 42. The Short Recension Mss attest two separate sequences: (1) KS have 39, 40, 43a, 42;[98] (2) the other Short Recension Mss have 39, 42, 40, 43a, 42. The rest of the chapter (i.e. §§ 43b, 43c, and 44) is then missing in the Short Recension. The Saadyan Recension has 39 followed by 41 in its chapter 5, while § 40 is placed in its chapter 3:4. It does not have 42, 43a, or 43b. Dunash ben Tamim does not cite § 41 and neither does Judah ben Barzillai. Donnolo has a considerably expanded and paraphrased form of this paragraph (Castelli 1880: 56–57). We have, then, a major rupture in the textual tradition of SY at this point and this cannot be unrelated to problems over the content of the material, as we will see when we review the whole of §§ 39–44.

The problem of § 41 needs to be discussed in relation to the parallel problem of §§ 36, 44, and 54, all of which are missing in the Short Recension and all of which are preserved in a single block in the Saadyan Recension (chapter eight).[99] None of these omissions can be explained by parablepsis. Both the sequences 32–34 + 41 + 52 and 36 + 44 + 54 take material which has already been discussed and recast it into a rigid literary framework with some slight expansions of the content. They enhance the rhythmic, poetic feel of SY and they also bind it closer into the world of rabbinic Judaism while adding nothing to its overall teaching. The phrase "binding a crown" constructs a link with the famous story in *b. Men* 29b of Rabbi Akiba's ascent to heaven. We have already seen the struggle that Joseph Dan has

[98] Dunash follows this sequence though he only seems to know 39, 42, 40, because he then moves on to § 45 (Vajda 1954: 54–55, Vajda-Fenton 2002: 124–126). Judah ben Barzillai follows the order of Mss KS and he, too, does not seem to know § 44.

[99] See also the notes on § 36.

to reconcile this sequence of SY material with its concept elsewhere of the creative process. What Dan depicts as SY's second way of describing the letters and their relation to the creator[100] – one which is more open to later mystical/kabbalistic exploitation, may, in fact, be the view of the editor responsible for the additions of the Long Recension. Could the "binding of the crowns" be on the same level as other, often weakly attested allusions to biblical and rabbinic tradition – superficial links to contemporary Jewish culture designed to make SY appear less strange or heterodox than it actually is? Such allusions, when more firmly rooted in the textual tradition, constitute natural "growth points" for any later attempts to bind SY more firmly into mainstream Jewish tradition. What is more difficult to decide (and probably impossible to determine without new manuscript evidence) is whether or not these tantalizing links to more normative tradition already present (like § 32–34) in the Short Recension do go back to the original author or belong entirely to the process of textual transmission. If § 32–34 belonged to the earliest text of SY, then why not §§ 41 and §§ 52? But if that was the case, why are the latter missing in the Short Recension, Dunash and Judah? Like the parallel sequence of 36 + 44 + 54, no mechanical explanation is available for their absence nor is it easy to see why they might have been objectionable to scribes who left §§ 32–34 in the text. On balance, it is easier to see all this material as part of the process of expansion which led to the emergence of the Long Recension.

The only textual problem of any consequence within § 41 concerns the length of the framework formula – המליך את ... וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו. Mss A and Z consistently attest the full formula but Mss C and D do so only in § 41.1. Note the omissions of וצרפן זה עם זה in Ms E. Are C and D abbreviating or A and Z expanding. The presence of the full formula in § 41.1 in all Mss suggests that the former alternative is the most probable. Clearly some scribes, having once presented the full formula, felt no need to restate it every time and abbreviated the rest – sometimes drastically as in D 41.5–7. Ms D has a similarly abbreviated text in § 52.

Ms C's errors this time are: (1) the omission of בשנה in 41.2 and (2) ראש instead of ריש in 41.6. The variants in the other Long Recension Mss recorded in Gruenwald's apparatus are either minor ones of syntax (e.g. זה בזה for זה עם זה) or clear errors.

Sefer Yeṣira § 42

A	K
ובהן נחקקו שבעה רקיעים ושבע ארצות ושבע שעות ושבעה ימים לפיכך חיבב שביעי לכל חפץ תחת השמים.	ובהן נחקקו. שבעה רקיעים. ושבע ארצות. ושבע שעות. ושבעה פעמים לפיכך חיבב שביעי תחת השמים.

[100] Dan 1993: 26–27.

And with them were carved out seven firmaments, seven earths, seven hours and seven times. Therefore he loved the seventh under heaven.

LMNSFPIQR collated to K:
ושבע פעמים] ימים F. שבתות] שעות LPQ, om LMNQ. מדברות] פעמים F, שבתות R. שביעי] add לכל חפץ MNSFPQ.

Mss LMNFPIQR have another distinctive form of this paragraph at the end of § 39. This form of the text is collated below to the text of Ms P:

P

ומהן חקק שבעה רקיעים ושבע ארצות ושבע שבתות לפיכך חבב שביעי לכל חפץ תחת השמים.

ימים ושבעה] שבתות MN. אדמות] ארצות F. מדברות] om MNFIQ. לכל חפץ] om MNIQ. השמים] pr כל MNIQ.

And with them were carved out seven firmaments, seven earths, seven hours and seven days. Therefore he loved the seventh above everything under heaven.

B^1B^2GDH collated to A:
שעות] שערות D.

Sefer Yeṣira § 43a

K

ואילו הן כוכבים בעולם חמה נוגה כוכב חמה לבנה שבתי צדק מאדים וימים בשנה שבעת ימי בראשית, ושבעה שערים בנפש: שתי עינים, ושתי אזנים, והנחירים, והפה.

These are the seven planets in the universe: Sun, Venus, Mercury, Moon, Saturn, Jupiter, Mars. And the days in the year: the seven days of creation. And the seven apertures in mankind: two eyes, two ears, two nostrils, and the mouth.

LMNSFPIQR collated to K:
בעולם] om F. והנחירים] ושני נחירי האף LP, שני אפים SFI, ושני נקבי האף MNQ.

A

ואילו הן שבעה כוכבים בעולם: חמה, נוגה, כוכב חמה, לבנה, שבתי, צדק, מאדים. ושבעה ימים שבעת ימי בראשית, ושבעה שערים בנפש שתי עינים ושתי אזנים ושתי נחיריים ופה.

These are the seven planets in the universe: Sun, Venus, Mercury, Moon, Saturn, Jupiter, Mars. And the seven days: the seven days of creation. And the seven apertures in mankind: two eyes, two ears, two nostrils, and the mouth.

B^1B^2GH collated to A:
בעולם] om H. נחיריים] אפים B^1, חוטמים B^2.

Sefer Yeṣira § 43b

A

ושבעה רקיעים: וילון, רקיע, שחקים, זבול, מעון, מכון, ערבות. ושבע ארצות: אדמה ארקה, תבל, נשייה, צייה, חלד, ארץ.

And the seven firmaments: Wilon, Raqia, Shehaqim, Zebul, Ma'on, Makon, Arabot. And the seven earths: 'adama, 'arqa, tebel, neshiyya, siyya, ḥeled, 'eretz.

B^1GH collated to A:
ארקה תבל נשייה צייה תבל ארץ גיא [אדמה...ארץ B^1. ארץ חלד יבשה [צייה חלד ארץ G.

Sefer Yeṣira § 43c

A

חיצה את העדים והעמידן אחה אחד לבדו, עולם לבדו, שנה לבדה, נפש לבדה.

He split up the witnesses and made each one stand by itself – the universe by itself, the year by itself, mankind by itself.

B^1B^2GDH = A. In Mss B^2GD this sentence is repeated after § 52 (= § 53).

C

חיצה את העדים והעמידן אחד אחד אחד לבדו עלם לבדו שנה לבדה נפש לבדה.

He split up the witnesses and made each one stand by itself – the universe by itself, the year by itself, mankind by itself.

ZE collated to C. The sentence is repeated after § 52 in all three Mss (= § 53).
אחד 3^0] om ZE.

Sefer Yeṣira § 44

A

שבע כפולות בגד כפרת
נוצר עם בית שבתי שבת ופה וחיים ומוות.
נוצר עם גימל צדק ואחד בשבת [69a] ועין ימין ושלום ורע
נוצר עם דל מאדים ושיני בשבת ועין שמאל וחכמה ואיולת.
נוצר עם כף חמה ושלישי בשבת ואף ימין ועושר ועוני.
נוצר עם פה נוגה ורביעי בשבת ואף שמאל וזרע ושממה.
נוצר עם ריש כוכב חמה וחמישי בשבת ואוזן ימין וחן וכיאור.
נוצר עם תיו לבנה וערב שבת ואוזן שמאל וממשלה ועבדות
זה בגד כפרת.

C

נוצר עם בית אילו שבתי שבת ופה וחיים ומות.
נוצר] עם גימל אלו צדק ואחד בשבת ו[עין ימין שלום] ורעה.
נוצר עם דלת אילו מאדים ושני ב[שבת ועין שמאל].חכמה ואוולת.
נוצר עם כף אילו חמה של[שי בשבת ואף] ימין עושר ועוני
נוצר עם פה אילו נוגה רבעי בשבת [ואף] שמאל זרע ושממה.
נוצר עם ריש אלו [כוכב חמה חמישי] בשבת ואוזן ימין חן וכיאור.
נוצר עם לבנה ערב ש[בת ואזן] שמאל ממשלה ועבדות.

Seven double letters: Bet, Gimel, Dalet; Kaf, Pe, Resh, Taw. There was formed with Bet: Saturn, the sabbath, the mouth, life and death. There was formed with Gimel: Jupiter, the first day of the week, the right eye, peace and evil. There was formed with Dalet: Mars, the second day of the week, the left eye, wisdom and folly. There was formed with Kaf: the Sun, the third day of the week, the right nostril, wealth and poverty. There was formed with Pe: Venus, the fourth day of the week, the left nostril, prosperity and desolation. There was formed with Resh: Mercury, the fifth day of the week, the right ear, beauty and ugliness. There was formed with Taw: the Moon, the preparation of the sabbath, the left ear, mastery and slavery.
This is Bet, Gimel, Dalet; Kaf, Pe, Resh, Taw.

There was formed with Bet these: Saturn, the sabbath, the mouth, life and death. There was formed with Gimel these: Jupiter, the first day of the week, the right eye, peace and evil. There was formed with Dalet these: Mars, the second day of the week, the left eye, wisdom and folly. There was formed with Kaf these: the Sun, the third day of the week, the right nostril, wealth and poverty. There was formed with Pe: Venus, the fourth day of the week, the left nostril, prosperity and desolation. There was formed with Resh these: Mercury, the fifth day of the week, the right ear, beauty and ugliness. There was formed with [Taw these]: the Moon, the preparation of the sabbath, the left ear, mastery and slavery.

B^1B^2GDH collated to A:
וכיאור] וכיעור B^1B^2GDH. ששי] וערב שבת D, וששי בשבת] זה בגד כפרת G. om D.

ZE collated to C:
ZE. תו אילו pr] לבנה E. וכיאור] וכיעור Z. ששי בשבת] ועבדות add] זה בגדכפרת E.

General Note on §§ 39–44

It is necessary at this point to look at the overall structure and textual situation of these paragraphs before considering in more detail the text of §§ 42–44. §§ 41–44 develop § 39 with two inconsistent streams of material. § 39 has the threefold structure which characterises SY elsewhere (§§ 48–49, 58–59), namely, that there is a harmony between the three spheres of reality – the universe, time, and mankind, corresponding to the three groupings of the twenty-two letters of the alphabet. Indeed, at least for the seven double and the twelve simple letters, the letters have a role in the creation of their corresponding levels of reality. § 43c explicitly spells out this underlying principle. § 43a is based on this threefold structure and simply spells out the כוכבים, ימים, and שערים of § 39. Note, for example, the paragraph order in Ms B^2 with § 43a following on directly from § 39 and no punctuation or space to mark a break between the two. §§ 41 and 44 similarly build on this pattern using the literary frameworks we have seen in §§ 32–34 and 36. However, the Long Recension form of § 42 and the duplicate form cited in the Short Recension after § 43a ignore this structure entirely and take us off in a completely separate direction. The source of its inspiration becomes clear when we look at its expansion in § 43b. This part of § 43 is present only in the Long Recension and then not in Mss B^2 or D. The list of the seven heavens is drawn directly from and follows exactly the text

of *b Ḥag* 12b while the list of the seven lands is closest to the Palestinian tradition in texts like ARN^{A} 37. See the comparative table in Séd 1981: 275.[101] § 44 combines § 43a with the seven opposites from § 37 all in the literary structure which first appears in § 36 and reappears in § 54. It ignores §§ 42 and 43b. So one line goes out from § 39 to §§ 42 and 43b, and another to §§ 41, 43a, 43c, and 44.

None of this material in §§ 41–44 is attested in all three recensions. In the notes to § 41 we have already seen that both it and § 44 are unlikely to have been present in the earliest recoverable text of SY. §§ 42 and 43 are not present in the Saadyan Recension while § 43b is weakly attested as we have already seen. Ms D does not have § 43a or 43b. §§ 43c and 44 are not present in the Short Recension while Dunash seems to know § 42 only in the form which is compatible with § 39 and shows no sign of §§ 41, 43 and 44.[102] How do we account for all this? We need to look more closely at the content of these paragraphs.

Despite the fact that he was working with a defective printed text of SY (Warsaw ed. 1884), Solomon Ganz has correctly observed that the author of SY in §§ 41 and 44 has "connected the seven planets in the natural order [of their supposed distance from the earth] שצ׳ם חנכ׳ל[103] with the first seven days instead of the first hours of creation." Consequently, §§ 42 and 43a with their reference to the "seven hours" and the order חנכ׳ל שצ׳ם[104] must be "the gloss of an editor who wished to reconcile the theory of the Book of Creation with the accepted theory of the planetary week".[105] So the later editor "mentions the seven hours and changes the sequence שצ׳ם חנכ׳ל into the sequence חנכ׳ל שצ׳ם to correspond with the first seven hours of the first day of the week" (*ibid.*). It is interesting that Shabbetai Donnolo was acutely conscious of this discrepancy and expressed the necessity of correcting the aberrant contents of SY at this point.[106] The absence of §§ 42 and 43 in the Saadyan Recension would appear to give strong support to this conclusion. But the Short Recension, as we have seen, does not have §§ 41 and 44 which list the (apparently aberrant) collocation of the planets and the days of the week, and the arranger of the Saadyan Recension could have left out §§ 42 and 43 because he sensed this disharmony with §§ 41 and 44.

The first printed edition of SY (Mantua 1562)[107] represents what may be another editorial solution to the disharmony between these paragraphs: in § 43a it lists the

---

[101] See also Halperin 1988: 276, n. 28.

[102] Vajda 1954: 54 and Vajda-Fenton 2002: 124. Judah ben Barzillai has 39, 40, 43a, 42 in that order. He has the Ms K form of § 42 (Halberstam 1885: 237, 245).

[103] I.e. שבתי צדק מאדים חמה נוגה כוכב־חמה לבנה.

[104] I.e. חמה נוגה כוכב־חמה לבנה שבתי צדק מאדים.

[105] "The Origin of the Planetary Week *or* The Planetary Week in Hebrew Literature", *Proceedings of the American Academy of Jewish Research*, 18 (1948/49), p. 238. So also Epstein 1894: 68, n. 6 – SY § 42 "paraissent avoir été interpolé plus tard."

[106] See Castelli 1880: 59–61, English translation in Ganz 1948/9: 239–240, and also Sharf 1976: 27–28.

[107] ^{2}ת in Gruenwald's apparatus.

planets in the order שצ״ם חנכ״ל, i.e. exactly as §§ 41 and 44. The editorial change is simple: just swap round שצ״ם and חנכ״ל. It is interesting that when Judah Ha-Levi cites SY § 43a he gives the planets in the order שצ״ם חנכ״ל even though he alters the corresponding days to fit in with the usual astrological pattern.[108] Could שצ״ם חנכ״ל be the original reading of § 43a?

A possible suggestion of the way in which the textual tradition of SY §§ 41–44 developed is as follows:

(1) At their base lies the Saadyan recension form of § 39.

(2) Two parallel expansions of § 39 then emerged: firstly, the form of § 42 attested in most Short Recension Mss after § 39 and in Dunash, and secondly, § 43a with the planets in the order שצ״ם חנכ״ל.

(3) A later editor expanded the original § 43a and put together the planets, the specific days of the week, and the seven human apertures – all connected to the seven double letters. This produced § 41, later expanded in § 44 (which, as we have seen, simply puts § 41 and § 37 together).

(4) A still later scribe saw, like Shabbetai Donnolo, that SY's arrangement of the planets and the days of the week did not conform to the correct astrological ordering of the planetary hours. Hence he reshaped § 42 into the form seen in the Long Recension and the duplicate Short Recension version (the Ms K form placed after § 43a with its reference to the planetary hours), and he reversed the order of שצ״ם חנכ״ל in § 43a so that it corresponded with the order of the planetary hours counting from the morning of the first day (Sunday), i.e. חנכ״ל שצ״ם. He thus created a fundamental disharmony in the text of SY.[109]

(5) The arranger of the Saadyan Recension left out §§ 42 and 43a-b either because they were not in the text with which he was working or because he perceived their inconsistency with §§ 41 and 44.

(6) § 43b was added at a very late stage as its weak attestation in only some Mss of the Long Recension shows.

It looks, then, as though we can allocate only § 39 to the earliest recoverable text of SY – to the stage well before later editors attempted to make SY conform to their contemporary astrological lore. However, although § 43c is not present in the Short Recension it contains nothing which is inconsistent with material we have isolated as belonging to the earliest stage of the SY tradition, nor does it contain

[108] "In the year: Sabbath, Thursday, Tuesday, Sunday, Friday, Wednesday, Monday" (*Kuzari* 4:25) – Cassel 1869: 345.

[109] To have ironed out the discrepancies would have involved a major reconstruction of these paragraphs. Compare what Emmanuel Tov says about the biblical text: "As a rule, differences in major details have not been changed. After all, there are too many major differences between the laws and stories in the Pentateuch, so that any attempt to harmonize between them would result in a major rewriting of the Bible". And further on: "in biblical Mss harmonizing additions are more frequent than harmonistic changes. This situation is easily understandable, as the degree of intervention in the text is more limited for additions than for changes" (1985: 9, 11).

anything which is characteristic of the Long Recension additions. In fact, it states rather clearly one of the fundamental structuring principles of SY. Nevertheless, its absence in the Short Recension prevents us assigning it with any confidence to stage (1) above. I place it in square brackets in my reconstructed SY text to indicate both my feeling that it may be quite early but also its weaker textual attestation.

Notes on the text of § 42

The earliest form of § 42 will, then, be the form as cited in Mss L...R after § 39. The duplicate form cited after § 43a in most Short Recension Mss and the sole form cited in the Long Recension reflects the impact on the text of SY of the editorial changes discussed above. In this form the original שבע שבתות has been altered to שבע שעות except in Mss LPQ. Ms D's שערות for שעות is probably an error while Ms R's שבתות for פעמים is probably a relic of the earlier reading. The addition of שבעה פעמים in most Short Recension Mss (but not LMNQ) and ימים in the Long Recension may have been intended to reinforce the astrological connection of the hours and the days of the week. The scribe of Ms F has clearly decided to try and harmonize his two versions of § 42. The phrase לכל חפץ seems necessary to the sense of the last sentence of the paragraph but it is not well attested in the Short Recension Mss and may have been a strengthening addition like the כל before שמים in Mss MNIQ. Neither is present in Dunash's citation of the paragraph.

Notes on the text of § 43a

The only textual disturbance here is over the precise specification of the two nostrils. The variants are harmonizing with § 41.5, 44, and 62. חוטם as in Ms B^2 appears in § 63 in some Mss.

Notes on the text of § 43b

The variants concern only the list of the seven names for the earth and involve mainly changes of word order. With the list in Ms G compare PRK, Rosh Ha-Shanah 10 (Mandelbaum 1987: 343–344).

Notes on the text of § 43c

The third אחד in Ms C is clearly a duplication.

Notes on the text of § 44

שבע כפולות בגד כפרת (Long Recension). See the note on the introductory formula שלוש אימות אמש in § 36. The introductory formula here in § 44 is introduced for precisely the same reason. It is not required in the Saadyan version where §§ 36, 44, and 54 are all in one continuous block of material – probably the original arrangement. The conclusion זה בגד כפרת is likewise not present in the Saadyan version for the same reason, since it goes on immediately to apply the set structure to the twelve simple letters. It is missing in Ms D but added in Ms E. For the variant spelling of כיעור see the text and apparatus of § 37. תו אילו was obviously omitted in error by the scribe of Ms C. We noted in § 41 the tendency of Ms D to shorten the text. It does so again in § 44, omitting נוצר after its first two occurrences.

Sefer Yeṣira § 45

K

שתים עשרה פשוטות הוזחטילזסעצק יסודן: ראיה, שמיעה, ריחה, שיחה, לעיטה, [38a] תשמיש, מעשה, הילוך, רוגז, שחוק, הרהור, שינה.

Twelve simple letters: He, Waw, Zayin, Ḥet, Tet, Yod, Lamed, Nun, Samek, Ayin, Sade, Qof. Their basis is sight, hearing, smelling, talking, eating, sexual intercourse, action, walking, anger, laughter, thought, sleep.

LMNSFPIQR collated to K:
שתים] pr מדתן MNFIQ.
יסודן] om Q. ריחה] ריח Q.
תשמיש] תשמיש המטה F.
שינה] add ודבור F.

A

שתים עשרה פשוטות הוזחטילזסעצק יסודן ראייה שמיעה הריחה ושהות ולעיטה ותשמיש מעשה והילוך רוגז ושחוק הירהור ושינה.

Twelve simple letters: He, Waw, Zayin, Ḥet, Tet, Yod, Lamed, Nun, Samek, Ayin, Sade, Qof. Their basis is sight, hearing, smelling, time, eating, sexual intercourse, action, walking, anger, laughter, thought and sleep.

D

שתים עשרה פשוטות יסודן ראייה שמיעה ריחה שיחה לעיטה תשמיש מעשה הלוך רוגז שחוק הדבור ושינה.

B^1B^2GH collated to A:
סודן] יסודן B^2. הריחה] הריחה ושהות B^2. שיחה] ריחה B^1B^2GH.

C

שתים עשרה פשוטות [הוזחטילנס]ע[צק] יסודן חיים ראיה שמיעה ריחה לע[יט]ה מע[שה והילוך] רוגז שחוק הירהור כאור ישינה.

Twelve simple letters: He, Waw, Zayin, Ḥet, Tet, Yod, Lamed, Nun, Samek, Ayin, Sade, Qof. Their basis is life, sight, hearing, smelling, talking, eating, action, walking, anger, laughter, ugliness and sleep.

Z

שתים עשרה פשוטות הוזחטילסעצק יסודן ראיה שמיעה ריחה שיחה לעיטה תשמיש מעשה והילוך רוגז שחוק הרהור ושינה.

E collated to Z:
בריחה] ריחה E.

Notes on the text of § 45

§ 45 has a fixed position in the Long and Short Recensions – at the beginning of chapter five according to most Mss. In the Saadyan Recension it is found in the first run through the 10, 3, 7 and 12 in chapter 1:3. Clearly the arranger of the Saadyan Recension found it at the beginning of chapter five in his base text and naturally selected it as his first example of a paragraph on the "twelve simple letters", just as in the same paragraph he has selected § 23 from the beginning of chapter 3 and § 37a from the beginning of chapter four. The minor variations in the textual tradition of this paragraph are mostly easily detected errors. Some slight variants in the order of the bodily functions have not been thought worth recording in the apparatus.

הריחה] הריחה AB^{1}GH . The testimony of most other Mss suggests that the He at the beginning of this word is a dittography of the one at the end of שמיעה, since otherwise the word הריחה is unknown.[110] A word הרחה is known from Rashi onwards. The error must be an early one in the Long Recension since it has spread to B^{1}GH. Could בריחה in Ms E be an attempt to correct this error?

ושהות in Ms A must be an error. All other Mss read שיחה (conversation).

On the omission of יסודן in Ms Q see the notes to § 2. B^{2}'s reading סודן is found in B^{1} in § 37 (וסודן for יסודן).

Ms C has the usual selection of errors. חיים and כאור come in from § 37, and תשמיש and שיחה are omitted. ישינה is an error for ושינה. Mss Z and E do not contain these errors of C and stick closer to the common text found in the other recensions.

Dunash ben Tamin has an interesting comment at this point. He is not happy with the text of § 45 as he received it because it mentions only three of the five senses. He proceeds to tell us what it should have said but then follows with a highly significant general comment on the state of the text of SY:

"Mais nous avons déja dit qu'il pouvait y avoir dans ce livre des passages altérés que le patriarche Abraham [n'a jamais énoncés], [provenant] des commentaires en hébreu, auxquels des gens ignorants ont ajouté postérieurement un autre commentaire et la vérité se perdait entretemps. Nous avons l'intention de corriger ce chapitre et de le reconstituer selon nos forces" (Vajda-Fenton 2002: 129).[111]

The Hebrew text of SY § 45 cited within the Arabic text of the Genizah fragment (Vajda 1954: 55) seems to have been emended to conform to at least part

[110] Alternatively, a scribe could have been influenced by the beginning of Isa 11:3. See Kimhi's commentary *ad loc.*

[111] The Arabic text of this passage seems to have suffered some damage; hence the restorations in Vajda's translation. Moses ben Joseph's careful translation is as follows:
אך שכבר אמרנו כי יתכן להיות בזה הספר דברים מחולפים מה שלא אמרם אברהם אבינו ע"ה כי פורש הספר בלשון עברי. ובאו אחר כן אנשים אוילים ויפרשו הפירוש אחר ותעדר האמת בנתים. ונראה לתקן זה הפרק וליפהו כפי הכח.
The looser translation in Ms Oxford 2250 (Grosberg 65) reflects essentially the same Arabic text.

of Dunash's comment on this paragraph: לעיטה has been replaced by חכמה – a change reflected in the Oxford 2250 translation. Moses ben Joseph's translation has retained the common text attested in nearly all our Mss (Vajda-Fenton 2002: 241). It is certainly the case, as we shall see, that this final chapter of SY in most Mss has suffered more insertions of later material than the preceding chapters.[112]

Sefer Yeṣira § 46

A

שתים עשרה פשוטות הוזחטילנסעצק שתים עשרה ולא אחת עשרה.

Twelve simple letters: He, Waw, Zayin, Ḥet, Tet, Yod, Lamed, Nun, Samek, Ayin, Sade, Qof. Twelve and not eleven.

C

שתים עשרה פשוטות פשותות הו זח טי לן.סע.צק שתים עשרה ולא עשתי עשרה, שתים עשרה ולא שלוש עשרה.

Twelve simple letters: He, Waw, Zayin, Ḥet, Tet, Yod, Lamed, Nun, Samek, Ayin, Sade, Qof. Twelve and not eleven, twelve and not thirteen.

D

שתים עשרה ולא אחת עשרה שתים עשרה ולא שלש עשרה

B^1B^2GH collated to A:
שתים 1^0] pr מדתן B^2. אחת] om G. עשרה 3^0] add ולא שלש עשרה B^1G.

ZE collated to C:
פשוטות 1^0] om ZE. הו זח טי לן.סע.צק] om Z.

Notes on the text of § 46

We have already had occasion to comment on the textual status of § 46 in connection with § 38. There we saw that the part of the Long and Saadyan Recensions which reads שבע ולא שש שבע ולא שמונה is unlikely to belong to the earliest recoverable text of SY. It is not present in the Short Recension like the whole of § 46 here. There is no comparable saying for the "three mothers" which leaves only § 4 attesting this construction in all three recensions. We can only assume that § 46 was built up on the model of § 4, just like § 38 in the Long and Saadyan Recensions. Ms D appends it directly to § 45 without the introductory rubric, perhaps reflecting its origin as an expansion out of that paragraph. The comparison with §§ 4 and 38 would suggest that only Ms D has preserved intact the original text of the Long Recension in this paragraph. All the Long Recension Mss have suffered to a greater or

[112] Weinstock 1972: 11 takes this passage from Dunash as his starting point for unravelling the history of the text of SY.

lesser extent from omissions by parablepsis. The omissions in Mss Z and E may be remnants of an earlier shorter text closer to that of D. Dunash does not cite § 46 but passes directly from § 45 to § 47. Judah ben Barzillai cites it in a form which reflects the problems in the Long Recension Mss (Halberstam 1885: 253). Donnolo has a text of this paragraph identical with the Saadyan version (Castelli 1880: 72–73).

In the Saadyan Recension § 46 is combined with § 47 to make chapter 2:4. Together they provide the "twelve simple letters" material for this second run through the 10, 3, 7 and 12. This confirms our paragraph's original position after § 45 in the text before the Saadyan reviser.[113]

Sefer Yeṣira § 47

C

שנים עשר גבולי אלכסן
מפוצלין לששה סדרים
מופסקין בן רוח לרוח.
גבול מזרחית דרומית,
גבול מזרחית צפונית, גבול
מזרחית רומית, גבול מזרחית
תחתית, גבול מזרחית ערבית,
גבול מערבית צפונית, גבול
מערבית דרומית, גבול
מערבית רומית, גבול מערבית
תחתית, גבול צפון
[T-S 32/5 begins] ית
מערבית, גבול צפונית רומית,
גבול צפונית תחתית, גבול
דרומית מערבית, גבול
מערבית מזרחית, גבול
דומית רומית, גבול [ד]רומית
תחתית.

Twelve diagonal lines, radiating out to the six faces (of a cube), separating in each direction: – the south-eastern line, the north eastern line, the upper eastern line, the lower eastern line, the east western line, the north-western line, the south western line, the upper western line, the north western line, the

A

שנים עשר גבולי אכלוסין
מופצלין לששה סדרים
מופסקין בין רוח לרוח
גבול מזרחית דרומית גבול
מזרחית רומית גבול מזרחית
תחתית גבול צפונית תחתית
גבול צפונית מערבית גבול
צפונית רומית גבול מערבית
תחתית גבול מערבית
רומית גבול מערבית רומית
גבול מערבית תחתית גבול
דרומית תחתית גבול דרומית
רומית ומרחיבין והולכין עד
עדי עד והן הן זרועות עולם.

Twelve diagonal lines, radiating out to the six faces (of a cube), separating in each direction: – the south-eastern line, the upper eastern line, the lower eastern line, the lower northern line, the north-western line, the upper northern line, the lower western line, the upper western line, the upper western

K

מדתן שנים עשר גבולי
אלכסון גבול מזרחית צפונית,
גבול מזרחית דרומית, גבול
מזרחית רומית, גבול מזרחית
תחתית, גבול צפונית תחתית,
גבול צפונית מערבית, גבול
צפונית רומית, גבול מערבית
תחתית, גבול מערבית
דרומית, גבול מערבית רומית,
גבול דרומית תחתית, גבול
דרומית רומית, ומרחיבין
והולכין עד עדי עד והן הן
זרועות עולם.

Their measure is twelve diagonal lines: the north eastern line, the south-eastern line, the upper eastern line, the lower eastern line, the lower northern line, the north-western line, the upper northern line, the lower western line, the south western line, the upper western line, the lower southern line, the

[113] Naturally, they are preceded by § 24a and 37b/38, material placed in comparable second positions in chapters three and four of the earlier text.

upper southern line. And they expand continually for ever and ever and *they are the arms of the universe* (cf. Deut.33:27).

line, the lower western line, the lower southern line, the upper southern line. And they expand continually for ever and ever and *they are the arms of the universe* (cf. Deut.33:27).

upper northern line, the lower northern line, the south western line, the west eastern line, the upper upper [southern] line, the lower southern line.

LMNSFPIQR collated to part of Ms K, i.e. מדתן...אלכסון and ומרחיבין...עולם:
גבולי] גבולים MN.
אלכסון] אלכסונים LFPIR, באלכסון M, באלכסונים N, אלוכסון Q.

B^1B^2GH collated to part of Ms A, i.e. שנים...לרוח and ומרחיבין...עולם:
גבולי] מדתן pr B^2. שנים] גבולים B^1GH. אכלוסין] אלכסן B^2, אלכסין B^1, אלכסונים GD, אוכלסין H. לשבעה] H. זרועות לששה B^1H. גבעות

ZE collated to part of C, i.e. שנים...לרוח:

אלכסון] אלכסן E.
מפצלין] מפוצלין ZE.
מפסקין] מופסקין Z.

Notes on the text of § 47

All the copyists understandably had trouble with this list of boundaries/lines. Clearly the context requires that there should be twelve of these. Copyists rarely achieved this; e.g., Ms C has sixteen, Ms Z eleven, Ms E nine. Ms A manages to get twelve but only by duplicating גבול מערבית רומית. Since the order and number of the boundaries/lines differs in all the Mss I have left these variations out of the critical apparatus. They are listed in Gruenwald's edition (p. 163f). If we take as our base text what the three recensions have in common, then two expansions become visible:

(1) מופצלין לששה סדרים מופסקין בין רוח לרוח in the Long and Saadyan Recensions. It is not present in the Short Recension. This expansion harmonizes § 47 with § 38 in its Long and Saadyan Recension form. In the Saadyan Recension, as we have seen, § 38 directly precedes §§ 46/47. Judah ben Barzillai offers a number of variant readings for this expansion, only some of which appear in our manuscripts (Halberstam 1885: 253).

(2) ומרחיבין והולכין עד עדי עד והן הן זרועות עולם in the Short and Long Recensions. It is not present in the Saadyan Recension. This provides a link with the biblical text (Deut 33:27) and with many other Jewish cosmological speculations of the first millennium C.E.[114] The two verbs in this expansion were probably drawn from Resh Laqish's words in *b. Ḥag.* 12a (הים היה מרחיב והולך); cf Liebes 2000:173.

Apart from these two expansions of the earlier text, the differences between the Mss boil down to problems over the syntax of the phrase גבולי אלכסון and the

[114] See Hayman 1986 and 1987 (especially, pp. 78–80).

spelling of אלכסון.[115] Scribal confusion over the spelling of Greek loan words in Hebrew is normal.

דומית in Ms C is an error, the Resh having been omitted. Mss Z and E have the correct דרומית. It is not a case, as Allony's transcription (1981: 19) would suggest (רומית[ד]) of the initial letter of the word being obscure.

Sefer Yeṣira § 48a

C	A	K
שתים עשרה שתים עשרה פשוטות פשוטות הו זח טי לן סע צק. חקקן צרפן שקלן חצבן הימירן		
שתים עשרה פשוטות פשוטות הו זח טי לן סע צק. חקקן חצבן שקלן והימירן צרפן וצר בהן מזלות וחדשים ומנהיגין שני עליזים ושני לועזים ושני נועזים ושני עליצים והן קרקבנין שתי ידיים ושתי רגליים עשאן כמן מריבה וערכן כמן מלחמה זה לעומת זה עשאן האלהים.	שתים עשרה פשוטות הוזחטילסעצק חקקן צרפן חצבן שקלן והמירן וצר בהן מזלות וחדשים ומנהיגין שני עליזין ושני לועזין ושני נועזין ושני עליצין והן קורקבנין ושתי ידים ושתי רגלים [fol. 70a] עשאן כמן מריבה ערכן כמן מלחמה זה לעומת זה	עשאן כמין מריבה וערכן כמין מלחמה גם את זה לעמת זה עשה האלהים.
Twelve simple letters: He, Waw, Zayin, Ḥet, Tet, Yod, Lamed, Nun, Samek, Ayin, Sade, Qof. He carved them, he hewed them, he weighed them, and exchanged them, he combined them, and formed with them the constellations, the months, and the principal (bodily) organs: two exultant ones, two babbling ones, two deliberating ones and two rejoicing ones. They are the internal organs, the two hands and feet. He made them a sort of lawsuit, he arranged them in battle array, *one opposite the other* (Qoh 7:14).[116]	Twelve simple letters: He, Waw, Zayin, Ḥet, Tet, Yod, Lamed, Nun, Samek, Ayin, Sade, Qof. He carved them, he combined them, he hewed them, he weighed them and exchanged them, and formed with them the constellations, the months, and the principal (bodily) organs: two exultant ones, two babbling ones, two deliberating ones and two rejoicing ones. They are the internal organs and the two hands and feet. He made them a sort of lawsuit, he arranged them in battle array, *one opposite the other* (Qoh 7:14).	He made them a sort of lawsuit, he arranged them in battle array, *one opposite the other God made them* (Qoh 7:14).

[115] Ms F introduces a variant spelling immediately after אלכסונים, namely ויש גורסין אוכלוסין.

[116] Translation of the second (ch. 6:1) version only.

Z

שתים עשרה פשוטות הוזח טילן סעצק. חקקן חצבן צרפן שקלן והמירן (3.4) שתים עשרה פשוטות הוזחטילןסעצק חקקן חצבן צרפן שקלן והימירן וצר בהן מזלות חדשים ומנהיגין שני לעיזים ושני עליזים שני נועזים ושני עליצים והן קרקבנין ושתי ידים ושתי רגלים. עשאן כמן מריבה וערכן כמן מלחמה וזה לעומת זה עשאן האלהים. (6.1)

E collated to Z:
עליזים [לעיזים ושני עליזים add E. ושני לועזים [קרקבנין] ושתי כליות E.

D

שתים עשרה פשוטות חקקן צרפן חצבן שקלן והמירן וצר בהם מזלות וחדשים ומנהיגים שני עליזים. ושני לועזים. ושני נועזים. ושני עליצים. ושני טורפים. ושני ציידים. והם מרה וכבד והמסס וטחול וכליות כולית ימין וכולית שמאל קרקבן וקיבה שני ידים שני רגלים. עשאן כמין מריבה ערכן כמין מלחמה זה לעמת זה

G collated to A:
[מזלות וחדשים] om G. [צרפן שנים עשר מזלות ושנים עשר מנהיגים] om G. [כמן

MNFPlQR collated to K:
עשאן [וערכן] Q.

B[1]

שתים עשרה פשוטות הוז חטי לנס עצק חקקן חצבן שקלן המירן וצר בהן מזלות וחדשים ומנהיגים שני עליזים [fol. 8a] שני לועזים שני נועזין ושני עליצים ושני טורפין ושני ציירין שני עליצים המסס וטחול שני לועזים המרה והכבד שני נועצים שתי הכליות שני עליצים הקבה והקרקבן שני טורפין שתי ידים שני ציירים שתי רגלים והם קורקבנין ושתי ידים ושתי רגלים עשאן כמן מריבה ערכן כמן מלחמה זה לעומת זה

H collated to B[1]: בו [בהן] H. [קורקבנין] והקורקבנין.

B[2]

שתים עשרה פשוטות הוז חטי לן סע צק חקקן צרפן ושקלן והמירן וצר בהן שנים עשר מזלות בעולם טלה שור תאומים סרטן אריה בתולה מאזנים עקרב קשת גדי דלי דגים ו שנים עשר חדשים בשנה ושנים עשר מנהיגין: שני עליזין ושני לועזין, שני עליצין ושני נועזין. והן קורקבנין, ושתי ידים ושתי רגלים, שתי ידים ושתי רגלים ושתי כליות. כנגד מרה טחול ומסוס, קיבה וקרקבן. עשאן כמן מריבה ערכן מימים מלחמה. זה לעומת זה.

Sefer Yeṣira § 48b

C

שלשה אחד אחד לבדו שבעה שבעה חולקין ושלשה על שלשה ואחד חוק מכריע בנתיים. שנים עשר שנים עשר עומדין במלחמה שלשה אויבים ושלשה אוהבים ושלשה ממתים ושלשה מחיין

A

שלשה אחד אחד לבדו עומד שבעה שלשה חלוקין על שלשה ואחד חוק מכריע בנתיים שנים עשר עומדין במלחמה שלשה אויבים ושלשה אוהבים שלשה מחיים ושלשה ממיתים ואל

K

שלשה אחד אחד לבדו עומד שבעה חלוקין שלשה על שלשה ואחד מכריע בנתים. שנים עשר עומדין במלחמה שלשה אוהבין ושלשה שונאים. שלשה מחיים ושלשה ממיתים. אל מלך

וכולן אדוקין זה בזה סימן לדבר עשרים ושנים חפצים בגוף אחד.(6.2)

Three – each one stands by itself; seven are at loggerheads – three against three, and one is the law which holds the balance between them. Twelve stand in battle array: three are hostile but three love; three give life but three kill. And they all adhere to each other. The sign for the matter is: twenty-two objects in one body.

Z

שלשה אחד לבדו שבעה חלוקין שלשה על גבי שלשה ואחד חוק מכריע בינתים. שנים עשר שנים עשר עומדין במלחמה שלשה אוהבים ושלשה אויבים שלשה ממיתים ושלשה מחיים וכולן אדוקין זה עם זה וסימן לדבר עשרים ושתים חפצים וגוף אחד.(6.2)

E collated to C:

אחד 3º] om E. אויבים] שונאים E.

מלך נאמן מושל בכולן אחד על גבי שלשה ושלשה על גבי שבעה ושבעה על גבי שנים עשר וכולן אדוקין זה בזה וסימן לדבר עשרים ושנים חפצים כגוף אחד.

Three – each one stands by itself; seven – three are at loggerheads with three, and one is the law which holds the balance between them. Twelve stand in battle array: three are hostile but three love; three give life but three kill. And the divine, trustworthy king rules over them all – one on top of three, and three on top of seven, and seven on top of twelve. And they all adhere to each other. And the sign for the matter is: twenty-two objects in one body.

D

שלשה הם. וכל אחד ואחד לבדו עומד בשלשה עדים נאמנים .שבעה חלוקים שלשה שלשה ואחד חוק מכריע בנתים. [fol. 229a] שנים עשר עומדים במלחמה שלשה אויבים. שלשה אוהבים. שלשה ממתים. שלשה מחיים. ואל מלך נאמן מושל על כלן. אחד על גבי שלשה. ושלשה על גבי שבעה. ושבעה על גבי שנים עשר וכלן אדוקין זה בזה.

B^1B^2GH collated to A:

אחד אחד אחד] אחד אחד חלוקין] שלשה חלוקין B^2. שלש] אויבים/אוהבים B^2. שלשה מחיים/ transp B^2G. ושלשה ממיתים] transp B^1H. נאמן] om G. בגוף] וגוף G.

נאמן מושל בכולן אחד על גבי שלשה ושלשה על גבי שבעה ושבעה על גבי שנים עשר וכולן אדוקין זה בזה.

Three – each one stands by itself; seven are at loggerheads – three against three, and one is the law which holds the balance between them. Twelve stand in battle array: three love but three hate; three give life but three kill. And the divine, trustworthy king rules over them all – one on top of three, and three on top of seven, and seven on top of twelve. And they all adhere to each other.

LMNSFPIQR collated to K:

על .MNFP אחד אחד] וחק MNPIQ. מול] ואחד 1º] add MN. שלשה ממיתים] אוהבים הלב והאזנים והפה שלשה שונאים הכבד והמרה יוי] ואל .MNFPIQ והלשון אל S. מלך] om Q. בכולן] ממעון קדשו L, על הכל N.

Sefer Yeṣira § 49

K

(49a) שתים עשרה אותיות הו זח טי לן סע צק. חקקן, וחצבן, שקלן והמירן וצר בהם שנים עשר מזלות בעולם, שנים עשר חדשים בשנה, שנים עשר מנהיגים בנפש.

(49b) ואילו הן שנים עשר מזלות בעולם: טלה שור, תאומים, סרטן, אריה בתולה, מאזנים, עקרב קשת גדי, דלי דגים. ואילו הן שנים עשר חדשים בשנה: ניסן אייר סיון תמוז אב אלול, תשרי מרחשון כסליו, טבת שבת אדר. ואילו הן שנים עשר מנהיגין בנפש: יד ימין יד שמאל, רגל ימין, רגל שמאל, ושתי כליות, כבד, ומרה, טחול, המסס, קיבה, קרקבן.

(49a) Twelve simple letters: He, Waw, Zayin, Ḥet, Tet, Yod, Lamed, Nun, Samek, Ayin, Sade, Qof. He carved them and hewed them out, he weighed them and exchanged them, and formed with them the twelve constellations in the universe, the twelve months in the year, the twelve principal organs in mankind.

(49b) These are the twelve constellations in the universe: Aries, Taurus, Gemini, Cancer, Leo, Virgo, Libra, Scorpio, Sagittarius, Capricorn, Aquarius, Pisces. And these are the twelve months: Nisan, Iyar, Sivan, Tammuz, Av, Elul, Tishri, Marheshvan, Kislev, Tevet, Shevat, Adar. And these are the twelve principal organs in mankind: the right hand, the left hand, the right foot, the left foot, two kidneys, the liver, the gall, the spleen, the gullet, the stomach, the intestines.

LMNSFPIQR collated to K:
פשוטות] LMNFPIQR. צרפן [וחצבן] חצבן LI, צרפן MN, om F. [שקלן והמירן] om MNPQ. צרפן וצר [וצר] SQ, [צרפן ועשה] P. שנים עשר מזלות בעולם] 2^0 om MNFP. בעולם] 2^0 om Q. טלה] pr סימן MN. בשנה] 2^0 om LSPIQ.

A

(49a) שתים עשרה פשוטות הוזחטילנסעצק חקקן וחצבן צרפן שקלן והמירן וצר בהן שנים עשר מזלות בעולם ושנים עשר חדשים בשנה ושנים עשר מנהיגים בנפש.

(49b) ואילו הן שנים עשר מזלות טלה, שור, תאומים, סרטן, אריה, בתולה, מאזנים, עקרב, קשת, גדי, דלי, דגים. ושנים עשר חדשים ניסן, אייר, סיון, תמוז, אב, אלול, תשרי, מרחשוון, כסליו, טבת, שבת, אדר. אילו הן שנים עשר מנהיגין בנפש: שתי ידים, שתי רגלים, שתי כליות, כבד, ומרה, טחול, המסס, קרקבן, וקיבה.

(49a) Twelve simple letters: He, Waw, Zayin, Ḥet, Tet, Yod, Lamed, Nun, Samek, Ayin, Sade, Qof. He carved them and hewed them out, he combined them, weighed them and exchanged them, and formed with them the twelve constellations in the universe, the twelve months in the year, and the twelve principal organs in mankind.

(49b) These are the twelve constellations in the universe: Aries, Taurus, Gemini, Cancer, Leo, Virgo, Libra, Scorpio, Sagittarius, Capricorn, Aquarius, Pisces. And the twelve months are: Nisan, Iyar, Sivan, Tammuz, Av, Elul, Tishri, Marheshvan, Kislev, Tevet, Shevat, Adar. These are the twelve principal organs in mankind: two hands, two feet, two kidneys, the liver, the gall, the spleen, the gullet, the intestines and the stomach.

B^1B^2GDH collated to A:
חצבן [וחצבן צרפן B^2, om H. צרפן] B^2. מזלות 2^0] add בעולם B^1. וקבה...ואלו הן 1^0] om B^2D. ושנים עשר חדשים] om B^1. שתי רגל [שתי רגלים] B^1H. ידי ימין יד שמאל [ידים כלית ימין [שתי כליות ימין רגל שמאל B^1H. וכלית שמאל H, om (homoio?) B^1.

General Note on the text of §§48–49

§§48–49 are an overlapping complex of material distributed in different ways across the recensions and manuscripts. The paragraph numbering follows Gruenwald's edition which prints the text of Ms A as its base and then records the variations of all Mss from this base. If we look first at the text of Ms A it is clear that these two paragraphs duplicate each other. §49a simply expands §48a by adding the repeated numeral שנים עשר and the qualifying phrases בעולם, בשנה, and בנפש. This is very similar to the way in which a short earlier text of §39 preserved in the Saadyan Recension has been expanded in the Short and Long Recensions. §49b is then structured exactly like §43a which, as we have seen, probably represents the first stage of expansion from §39. §43a is not present in the Saadyan Recension and neither is §49b.

It is not too difficult to see that at the core of §§48–49 lies a simple sentence, similar in construction to the earlier form of §39:

שתים עשרה פשוטות חקקן צרפן חצבן שקלן והמירן וצר בהם מזלות וחדשים ומנהיגים

This sentence appears in §48a in Mss ADGB^{1} and chapter 6:1 in the Saadyan Recension (Mss CZE). There is a partial parallel to it also in §31 but we have seen that the content of that paragraph is problematic. This simple sentence is expanded in §49a in the Long and Short Recensions and in Ms B^{2}'s version of §48a. §49b then fills out the content of this now expanded short sentence – representing the second stage in its expansion. It is probably significant that while the Saadyan Recension does not have §49b (or §49a) some of the material in it appears in Saadya's commentary on §48. Moreover, Mss DB^{1}B^{2}H incorporate this commentary material directly into their version of §48, again giving us a clue as to how the text might have evolved. Mss B^{2} and D omit the whole of §49b. B^{1} and H repeat the duplicated material.

While it is relatively clear how SY §49 evolved, the situation in §48 is much more complicated. Let us consider first the order in which this material appears in the recensions. In the Saadyan Recension the simple sentence which we have isolated as the core of §§48–49 appears on its own in chapter 3:4, after 37b and before §40.[117] Then at the beginning of chapter 6 we find what is essentially the Long Recension version of §48, albeit with a shorter version of §48b. Chapters 5–8 of the Saadyan Recension are not organised on the firm principles of the first four chapters and their status in Saadya's commentary does, as we have already seen, create a presumption that the material they contain is less likely to belong to the core text of SY.

The positioning of §48 in the Short Recension is highly significant. The single sentence it has of §48a is placed *after* §49, and not before it as in the Long Recen-

[117] The artificial placing of §48a before §40 in ch 3:4 of the Saadyan Recension is revealed by the fact that §40 concerns the permutations of the number seven, not twelve.

sion. It looks like an inserted expansionary comment on § 49, drawing like § 60b on Qoh 7:14. It may be significant that not even this part of § 48a is present in Mss L and S. § 48b then appears in the Short Recension after § 60b. This would certainly seem to be a more logical position for it rather than in the section of SY which otherwise deals exclusively with the twelve simple letters. It belongs better with the summary material at the end of the work drawing together the threads and attempting to integrate themes treated earlier. It is clear, then, that the earlier simple forms of § 48a and § 48b were originally separate blocks of material. Most of § 48a in its Long and Saadyan Recension form is part of the same complex of material as § 49. § 48b has been attracted into its present position in the Long Recension (and hence from it into the Saadyan Recension) by the single sentence at the end of § 48a, which is all that most Short Recension Mss have, and which either arose as a short expansionary comment on the earlier version of §§ 48–49 which we have isolated above or, like § 48b belonged originally next to § 60. See the notes to § 60.

We may summarise the possible growth of §§ 48–49 as follows:

Stage (1): שתים עשרה פשוטות חקקן צרפן חצבן שקלן והמירן וצר בהם מזלות וחדשים ומנהיגים[118]

Stage (2): the expanded form of stage (1) as in § 49a.

Stage (3): § 49b as in the Short and Long Recensions.

Stage (4): § 48a as in the Short Recension.

Stage (5): § 48a sucks § 48b into the Long and Saadyan Recensions out of its original context after § 60b.

Stage (6): the expansion שני עליזים. ושני לועזים. ושני נועזים. ושני עליצים. ושני טורפים. ושני ציידים. והם מרה וכבד והמסס וטחול וכליות כולית ימין וכולית שמאל קרקבן וקיבה שני ידים שני רגלים appears in the Long and Saadyan versions of § 48a. It is not present in the Short Recension.

All these stages must have been completed prior to the creation of the Saadyan Recension. Its arranger seems simply to have taken the evolved form of § 48 (minus one later sentence) from the Long Recension, placed the core first sentence in his chapter 3:4 and the full paragraph in his chapter 6:1–2. Then, either he had a base text like Mss B^2 and D which did not contain § 49b or he left it out as constituting duplicate material.

The text of SY as cited in the other early commentaries throws valuable light on the process I have outlined above. Dunash ben Tamim's text is as follows:

שתים עשרה פשוטות חקקן צרפן חצבן וצר בהן שנים עשר מזלות בעולם ושנים עשר חדשים בשנה ושנים עשר מנהיגים בנפש שני ידים שני רגלים שתי כליות טחול כבד ומרה והמעה וקיבה וקרקבן עשאן כמין מריבה וערכן כמין מלחמה גם את זה לעומת זה עשה האלהים.[119]

[118] Whether the term מנהיגים would have been comprehensible on its own to the first readers of SY without the sort of explanations provided by § 49 is an issue which will have to be discussed on another occasion when we come to compose the commentary on the content of SY.

[119] Vajda 1954: 56, Vajda-Fenton 2002: 241–242.

Basically this represents stage (2) plus the part of stage (3) which spells out the twelve organs of the human body plus stage (4) – more or less a shortened version of the Short Recension. Hence Dunash takes us back to somewhere between stages (3) and (4) in the evolution of this material. However, later on in his commentary after § 60b he cites § 48b in the expanded form found in Mss MNFPIQ. Donnolo's text of § 48a is very similar to that of Ms B^1, i.e. integrating together the material of §§ 48 and 49 (Castelli 1880: 73–74). This reflects the style elsewhere of his commentary and again helps us to see how texts like that of B^1 and B^2 were created. Then like B^2 and D Donnolo has only § 49a without § 49b. He is at stage (6). Judah ben Barzillai cites § 49 (Halberstam 1885: 256) but like Mss L and S shows no knowledge of § 48a. He, therefore, takes us back to stage (3). What is striking about this information from the commentators is the way in which it confirms what we know from the manuscripts, namely, that by the tenth century all these various forms of the SY text in different stages of its evolution were available simultaneously. Most striking of all is that our latest commentator – Judah, has the text in an earlier stage of development than his tenth century predecessors.

Notes on the text of § 48a

We find the usual duplicate readings in Ms C – שתים עשרה once and פשוטות twice. Were it not that שתים עשרה is not duplicated in the second occurrence in ch 6:1, one might almost conclude that these duplications are deliberate – expressing distribution?

The reading לעיזים in Ms Z has arisen by a transposition of the initial two letters of עליזים as in C. The scribe's confusion is shown by the fact that the next term is לעליזים with the initial Lamedh crossed out.

There are inevitable variations in the lists of the bodily organs, especially as § 48 and 49 cross contaminate each other. See, e.g., Ms E's addition ושתי כליות which comes in from § 49 or Long Recension Mss like B^1 or B^2.

ושני טורפים (D) and ושני טורפין ושני צייריין (B^1). We can see here the original fourfold list (שני עליזין ושני לועזין ושני נועזין ושני עליצין) in the process of expansion as individual scribes try their hands at enhancing the text.

The dittography in Ms B^2 (ושתי ידים ושתי רגלים שתי ידים ושתי רגלים) may have been created as a by-product of the process of incorporating § 49b into § 48a. This is the only information provided twice in the form of §§ 48–49 which we find in Ms A. The text of B^2 was created by lifting the lists of the zodiacal signs and the bodily organs from § 49 and transferring them to § 48a. The list of months was left out (homoioteleuton?). In § 49b שתי ידים שתי רגלים heads the list of the bodily organs. When this list was transferred to the appropriate place in § 48a, after the reference to the bodily organs which ends with ושתי ידים ושתי רגלים, this dittography was created. A similar redundancy can be seen in the text of Mss B^1 and H. After the

insertion of 1⁰ רגלים ... ושני טורפין the statement 2⁰ רגלים ... הם קורקבנין becomes redundant, but it is left behind as a remnant of the earlier form of the text.

The Long Recension omits the words עשה האלהים of the quotation from Qoh 7:14, but this may reflect nothing more than the scribal practice of only citing part of a biblical quotation expecting the reader to understand the rest.

Notes on the text of § 48b

If we take as our core material what all the Mss have in common then two additions to this paragraph can be isolated:

(1) ואל מלך נאמן מושל בכולן אחד על גבי שלשה ושלשה על גבי שבעה ושבעה על גבי שנים עשר. This is not present in the Saadyan form of the text and some of it appears as a separate paragraph in Dunash's commentary.[120] It partially duplicates § 57.

(2) וסימן לדבר עשרים ושנים חפצים בגוף אחד. This is not present in the Short Recension or Ms D but it does appear in Dunash's commentary in the paragraph just mentioned although the material is arranged in a different order. It comes in from § 22. See the notes to that paragraph.

The expansion in Mss MNFPIQ reflects the sort of material that will grow into § 63, a paragraph which is attested in the Short Recension only in Mss K and R and, in the Saadyan Recension only in Ms E. Ms P has an alternative longer form of this expansion (inserted between בכולן and אחד) which will be cited in connection with § 63.

Notes on the text of § 49

The overwhelming weight of the evidence favours the reading פשוטות at the beginning of this paragraph rather than Ms K's אותיות as does the standard opening of most paragraphs in this fifth chapter of the work. Ms G abbreviates the text of this paragraph; e.g., צרפן...בנפש becomes וגו׳. Having incorporated most of § 49b into § 48a the scribe of Ms B^2 agrees with D in dropping this part of § 49. Most of the variants in the other Mss are either errors or expansions (like B^1H's spelling out of the pairs of organs). The scribe of B^1 probably had before him the same expansion of שתי כליות as we find in H, but his eye slipped from רגל שמאל to וכלית שמאל. The shared omission of שנים עשר מזלות בעולם (2⁰) in MNFP is worthy of note since they share the expansion in § 48b related to § 63 and the minor shared variant אחד also in that paragraph.

[120] ושנים חפצים בגוף אחד שנים עשר מנהיגים ושבעה שערים ושלש אמות אחד על גבי שלשה ושלשה על גבי שבעה ושבעה על גבי שנים עשר וכלם אדוקין זה בזה (Vajda-Fenton 2002: 247, and Fenton 1988: 51, lines 4–6).

Sefer Yeṣira § 50

K	P
שלש אמות, ושבע כפולות, ושתים עשרה פשוטות	שלש אמות שהן שלשה אבות שמהן יצא אש רוח מים שלש אמות, ושבע כפולות, ושתים עשרה פשוטות.
Three primary letters, and seven double letters, and twelve simple letters.	Three mothers[121] which are three fathers from which came forth fire, air, water – three primary letters, and seven double letters, and twelve simple letters.
LSIQR collated to K:	MNF collated to P:
אמות] add אמש S.	יצא] יוצא MN

Notes on the text of § 50

In Ms K the punctuation indicates that this is not an independent paragraph but functions as an introduction to § 56. That seems to be its function in all the Short Recension Mss, for they pass directly from § 50 to § 56 and do not attest §§ (51) –55. The paragraph is not present in the Long and Saadyan recensions and Gruenwald takes its text from the printed editions of SY. The longer version of § 50 found in Mss MNFP is related to § 27 but instead of the "fathers" coming from the "mothers", here they are identified with them. See the notes on § 27. At this point Dunash has the first sentence of Ms P (שלש אמות שהן שלשה אבות שמהן יצא אש רוח מים) and then moves on to § 58, attesting nothing in between – like most Short Recension Mss (Vajda 1954: 57). Judah, who has the Ms K version of this paragraph, does the same (Halberstam 1885: 257).

Sefer Yeṣira § 51

In Gruenwald's edition § 51, like § 50, is taken from the printed editions and not from Ms A. In reality it is a version of the first sentence of § 56. Since it has no independent existence in the Mss I have eliminated it from my edition. However, I have retained Gruenwald's numbering of the paragraphs in order to avoid confusion for readers using both our editions.

[121] The context here requires that the metaphor "mothers" be retained at this point rather than its meaning being "cashed out" in the translation.

Sefer Yeṣira § 52

C

כאזה צדכ צרפן זה הו זח טי לן סע צק.

1 המליך את הי וקשר לו כתר וצר בו טלה בעלם וניסן בשנה כבד בנפש.

2 המליך את וו וקשר לו כתר וצר בו שור בעלם ואייר בשנה ומרה בנפש.

3 המליך את זיין וקשר לו כתר וצר בו תאומים בעלם וסיון בשנה וטחול בנפש.

4 המליך את חית וקשר לו כתר וצר בו סרטן בעלם תמוז בשנה ומסס בנפש.

5 המליך את טית וקשר לו כתר וצר בו אריה בעלם אב בשנה וכוליה ימין בנפש.

6 המליך את יוד וקשר לו כתר וצר בו בתולה בעולם אלול בשנה וכליה שמאל בנפש.

7 המליך את למד וקשר לו כתר וצר בו מאזנים בעלם תשרי בשנה וקרקבן בנפש.

8 המליך את נון וקשר לו כתר וצר בו עקרב בעלם מרחשון בשנה וקיבה בנפש.

9 המליך את סמך וקשר לו כתר וצר בו קשת בעלם כסליו בשנה ויד שלימין בנפש.

10 המליך את עין ו[קשר] לו כתר וצר בו גדי בעלם טבת בשנה יד שמול בנפש.

11 המליך את צדי וקשר לו כתר וצר בו דלי בעלם שבט בשנה רגל ימין בנפש.

12 המליך את קוף וקשר לו כתר וצר בו דגים בעלם אדר בשנה [רג]ל שמאל בנפש.

1 He made He rule, and bound to it a crown, and formed with it Aries in the universe, Nisan in the year, and the liver in mankind.

A

1 המליך הי וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו טלה בעולם וניסן בשנה וכבד בנפש.

2 המליך את ויו וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו שור בעולם ואייר בשנה ומרה בנפש.

3 המליך את זיין וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו תאומים בעולם וסיון בשנה וטחול בנפש.

4 המליך את חית וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה בזה וצר בו סרטן בעולם ותמוז בשנה [fol. 70b] והמסס בנפש.

5 המליך את טית וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה בזה וצר בו אריה בעולם ואב בשנה וכוליה של ימין.

6 המליך את יוד וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו בתולה בעולם ואלול בשנה וכוליה שלשמאל בנפש.

7 המליך את למד וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו מאזנים בעולם ותשרי בשנה וקרקבן בנפש.

8 המליך את נון וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו עקרב בעולם ומרחשוון בשנה וקיבה בנפש.

9 המליך את סמך וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה עם זה וצר בו קשת בעולם וכסליו בשנה ויד ימין בנפש.

10 המליך את עין וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה בזה וצר בו גדי בעולם וטבת בשנה ויד שמאל בנפש.

11 המליך את צדי וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה בזה וצר בו דלי בעולם ושבט בשנה ורגל ימין בנפש.

12 המליך את קוף וקשר לו כתר וצרפן זה בזה וצר בו דגים בעולם ואדר בשנה ורגל שמאול בנפש.

1 He made He rule, and bound to it a crown, and combined one with another, and formed with it Aries in the universe, Nisan in the year, and the liver in mankind.

2 He made Waw rule, and bound to it a crown, and combined one with another, and formed with it Taurus in the universe, Iyyar in the year, and the gall in mankind.

3 He made Zayin rule, and bound to it a crown, and combined one with another, and formed with it Gemini in the universe, Sivan in the year, and the spleen in mankind.

4 He made Ḥet rule, and bound to it a crown, and combined one with another, and formed with it Cancer in the universe, Tammuz in the year, and the gullet in mankind.

5 He made Tet rule, and bound to it a crown, and combined one with another, and formed with it Leo in the universe, Av in the year, and the right kidney.

6 He made Yod rule, and bound to it a crown, and combined one with another, and formed with it Virgo in the universe, Elul in the year, and the left kidney in mankind.

7 He made Lamed rule, and bound to it a crown, and combined one with another, and formed with it Libra in the universe, Tishri in the year, and the intestines in mankind.

8 He made Nun rule, and bound to it a crown, and combined one with another, and formed with it Scorpio in the universe, Marheshvan in the year, and the stomach in mankind.

9 He made Samek rule, and bound to it a crown, and combined one with another, and formed with it Sagittarius in the universe, Kislev in the year, and the right hand in mankind.

10 He made Ayin rule, and bound to it a crown, and combined one with another, and formed with it Capricorn in the universe, Tevet in the year, and the left hand in mankind.

11 He made Sade rule, and bound to it a crown, and combined one with another, and formed with it Aquarius in the universe, Shevat in the year, and the right foot in mankind.

2 He made Waw rule, and bound to it a crown, and formed with it Taurus in the universe, Iyyar in the year, and the gall in mankind.

3 He made Zayin rule, and bound to it a crown, and formed with it Gemini in the universe, Sivan in the year, and the spleen in mankind.

4 He made Ḥet rule, and bound to it a crown, and formed with it Cancer in the universe, Tammuz in the year, and the gullet in mankind.

5 He made Tet rule, and bound to it a crown, and combined one with another, and formed with it Leo in the universe, Av in the year, and the right kidney in mankind.

6 He made Yod rule, and bound to it a crown, and formed with it Virgo in the universe, Elul in the year, and the left kidney in mankind.

7 He made Lamed rule, and bound to it a crown, and formed with it Libra in the universe, Tishri in the year, and the intestines in mankind.

8 He made Nun rule, and bound to it a crown, and formed with it Scorpio in the universe, Marheshvan in the year, and the stomach in mankind.

9 He made Samek rule, and bound to it a crown, and formed with it Sagittarius in the universe, Kislev in the year, and the right hand in mankind.

10 He made Ayin rule, and bound to it a crown, and formed with it Capricorn in the universe, Tevet in the year, and the left hand in mankind.

11 He made Sade rule, and bound to it a crown, and formed with it Aquarius in the universe, Shevat in the year, and the right foot in mankind.

12 He made Qof rule, and bound to it a crown, and combined one with another, and formed with it Pisces in the universe, Adar in the year, and the left foot in mankind.

12 He made Qof rule, and bound to it a crown, and formed with it Pisces in the universe, Adar in the year, and the left foot in mankind.

B^1B^2GDH collated to A:
2–12 וצרפן זה עם זה/בזה] om D
3–12 בהן [בו] G.
4 ומסיס [והמסס] B^{2c}.
5 בנפש [ימין] add B^1B^2 GDH.

ZE collated to C:
כאזה צדכ] כאיזצד Z, In E. זה] om ZE.
הו וה זח חז טי יט לן נל סע עס צק [הו...צק] קץ Z.
1–12 וצרפן זה עם זה [כתר] add Z.

Notes on the text of § 52

In the notes on §§ 32–34 and 41 we have already dealt with the position of this paragraph in the development of the text of SY, and seen that, along with them and §§ 36, 44 and 54, it is to be assigned to the major expansion of SY which produced the Long Recension. In the Saadyan Recension § 52 is preceded by §§ 48a-b and followed by § 53. Since in the Long Recension the combined §§ 48–49 is immediately followed by § 52 this indicates that the arranger of the Saadyan Recension simply lifted §§ 48–53 in a block from his Long Recension base text in order to create his chapter 6. The initial rubric in the Saadyan version of this paragraph (כאזה צדכ צרפן זה הו זח טי לן סע צק) has been constructed on the model of §§ 19b, 35 and 40. It may predate the insertion of the phrase וצרפן זה עם זה in most Mss of the Long Recension but not D. The absence of the phrase in Mss C and E but its insertion in Z might indicate that it did not belong in the earlier version of the paragraph. On the other hand, it might have been taken out once the introductory rubric was included and felt to cover the whole paragraph. Donnolo has a form of this introductory rubric – כיצד צרפן המירן (Castelli 1880: 74), but followed by a much expanded and paraphrased § 52.

Apart from the minor variant זה בזה/זה עם זה (not recorded in the apparatus), the other variants in the Mss are mainly simple scribal errors. Except for the omission of בנפש in sentence 5 Ms A has preserved the paragraph intact. The scribal correction of והמסס to ומסיס in B^2 is in line with the reading of this Ms in § 54.4. The reading כאזה צדכ in C is puzzling especially with a medial Kaph at the end of a word. This suggests that the scribe began to repeat כאזה, realised his error, stopped and then carried on without deleting the redundant Kaph. In sentence 10 Allony transcribes C as רגל שמאל where I read יד שמאל. רגל שמאל would be an error since רגל שמאל is created by Qoph (sentence 12). The Ms is very difficult to read at this point; either reading could be correct.

Sefer Yeṣira § 53 (= 43c)

C

חיצה את העדים וה[עמיד]ן אחד אחד לבדו עולם לבדו שנה [לבד]ה נפש לבדה.

He split up the witnesses and made each one stand by itself -- the universe by itself, the year by itself and mankind by itself.

ZE collated to C:
[שנה לבד/נפש לבדה E. והעמיד [והעמידן transp E.

D

חיצה את העדים והעמידן אחד אחד לבדו עולם לבדו. שנה לבדה. ונפש לבדה.

He split up the witnesses and made each one stand by itself -- the universe by itself, the year by itself and mankind by itself.

B^2G = D:
אחד 2^0] add אחד B^2.

Notes on the text of § 53

This repetition of § 43c is found in the Long Recension only in Mss B^2GD and in the Saadyan Recension. It is not present in the Short Recension. See the general note to §§ 39–44.

Sefer Yeṣira § 54

C

1 נוצר עם הי אילו טלה [ניסן וכבד] ראיה וסמיות.
2 נוצר עם וו אילו שור אייר מרה ושמועה וחרשות.
3 נוצר עם זיין אלו תאומים סיון טחול ריחה ותחרות.
4 נוצר עם חת אלו סרטן תמוז מסס סיחה ואלמות.
5 נוצר עם טית אלו אריה אב כוליה שלימין לעיטה ורעבתן.
6 נוצר עם יוד בתולה אלול כוליה שמאל מעשה וגדמות.
7 נוצר עם למד מאזנים תשרי קרקבן תשמיש וסרוס.
8 נוצר עם נון עקרב מרחשון קיבה הלוך ותגרות.
9 נוצר עם סמך קשת כסליו יד ימין רוגז ניטול כבד.
10 נוצר עם עין גדי טבת י[ד] שמאל שחוק ניטול טחול.

A

שתים עשרה פשוטות הוזחטילקסעצק

1 נוצר עם הי טלה ניסן וכבד וראייה וסמיות.
2 נוצר עם ויו שור אייר ומרה ושמיעה וחרשות.
3 נוצר עם זיין תאומים סיון וטחול וריחה וסרחות.
4 נוצר עם חית סרטן תמוז והמסס.
5 נוצר עם טית אריה אב וכוליה של ימין לעיטה ורעבתנות.
6 נוצר עם יוד בתולה אלול וכוליה של שמאל ומעשה וגידמות.
7 נוצר עם למד מאזנים תשרי וקרקבן תשמיש וסריות.
8 נוצר עם נון עקרב מרחשוון וקיבה והילוך וחיגרות.
9 נוצר עם סמך קשת [fol. 71a] וכסליו יד ימין ורוגז וניטול כבד.
10 נוצר עם עין גדי טבת ויד שמאל ושחוק וניטול טחול.

11 נוצר [עם] צדי דלי שבט רגל ימין הרהור ניטול הלב ואינ[נו].
12 נוצר עם קוף דגים אדר רגל שמאל ישינה מוות והלך לו.

11 נוצר עם צדי דלי שבט רגל ימין והירהור וניטול הלב.
12 נוצר עם קוף דגים אדר ורגל שמאל וישיבה ומעות.

Twelve simple letters: He, Waw, Zayin, Ḥet, Tet, Yod, Lamed, Nun, Samek, Ayin, Sade, Qof.

1 There was formed with He these: Aries, Nisan, the liver, sight and blindness.

2 There was formed with Waw these: Taurus, Iyyar, the gall, hearing and deafness.

3 There was formed with Zayin these: Gemini, Sivan, the spleen, smelling and anosmia (?).
4 There was formed with Ḥet these: Cancer, Tammuz, the gullet, talking and dumbness.

5 There was formed with Tet these: Leo, Av, the right kidney, eating and hunger.
6 There was formed with Yod: Virgo, Elul, the left kidney, action and paralysis.
7 There was formed with Lamed: Libra, Tishri, the intestines, sexual intercourse and impotence.
8 There was formed with Nun: Scorpio, Marheshvan, the stomach, walking and lameness (?).
9 There was formed with Samek: Sagittarius, Kislev, the right hand, anger and equanimity.
10 There was formed with Ayin: Capricorn, Tevet, the left hand, laughter and sadness.
11 There was formed with Sade: Aquarius, Shevat, the right leg, thought and thoughtlessness.
12 There was formed with Qof: Pisces, Adar, the left leg, sleep and insomnia (?)

1 There was formed with He: Aries, Nisan, the liver, sight and blindness.

2 There was formed with Waw: Taurus, Iyyar, the gall, hearing and deafness.

3 There was formed with Zayin: Gemini, Sivan, the spleen, smelling and anosmia (?).
4 There was formed with Ḥet: Cancer, Tammuz and the gullet.

5 There was formed with Tet: Leo, Av, the right kidney, eating and hunger.
6 There was formed with Yod: Virgo, Elul, the left kidney, action and paralysis.
7 There was formed with Lamed: Libra, Tishri, the intestines, sexual intercourse and impotence.
8 There was formed with Nun: Scorpio, Marheshvan, the stomach, walking and lameness.
9 There was formed with Samek: Sagittarius, Kislev, the right hand, anger and equanimity.
10 There was formed with Ayin: Capricorn, Tevet, the left hand, laughter and sadness.
11 There was formed with Sade: Aquarius, Shevat, the right leg, thought and thoughtlessness.
12 There was formed with Qof: Pisces, Adar, the left leg, sitting and insomnia (?).

Z

1 נוצר עם הי אילו טלה ניסן וכבד ראיה וסמיות.

D

שתים עשרה פשוטות. הוזח טי לנ סע צק.
1 נוצר עם ה׳ טלה ניסן כבד ראיה וסמיות.

2 נוצר עם וו אילו שור אייר ומרה שמיעה וחרשות.
3 נוצר עם זיין אילו תאומים סיון וטחול ריחה ותתרות.
4 נוצר עם חת אילו סרטן תמוז ומסיס סיחה ואלמות.
5 נוצר עם טית אילו אריה אב וכוליה שלימין לעיטה ורעבתן.
6 נוצר עם יוד אילו בתולה אלול וכוליא שלשמאל תשמיש וסירוס.
7 נוצר עם למד אילו מאזנים תשרי וקרקבן מעשה וגידמות.
8 נוצר עם נון אילו עקרב מרחשון וקיבה הלוך וחיגרות.
9 נוצר עם סמך אילו קשת כסלו ויד ימין רוגז וניטול כבד.
10 נוצר עם עין אילו גדי טבת ויד שמאל שחוק ניטול טחול.
11 נוצר עם צדי אילו דלי שבט ורגל ימין הרהור ניטול הלב ואיננו.
12 נוצר עם קוף אילו דגים אדר ורגל שמאל שינה מת והלך לו.

2 עם ו׳ שור אייר מרה שמיעת חרשות.
3 עם ז׳ תאומים סיון טחול ריחה.
4 עם ח׳ סרטן תמוז המסס שיחה אלמות
5 עם ט׳ אריה אב כוליית ימין לעיטה רעבנות.
6 עם י׳ בתולה אלול כוליית שמאל ומעשה וגדמות.
7 עם ל׳ מאזנים תשרי קרקבן תשמיש וסרוס.
8 עם נ׳ עקרב ומרחשוון קיבה הלוך חגרות.
9 עם ס׳ קשת כסליו יד ימין רגז ורחמים.
10 עם ע׳ ק׳ גדי טבת יד שמאל. שחוק כליה.
11 עם צ׳ דלי שבט רגל ימין מחשבה ושמחה.
12 עם ק׳ דגים אדר רגל שמאל שינה וקיצה.

E collated to Z:

1 וסימפומות] E.
3 ריחה] ורווחה E. תסכות] ותתרות E(?).
6 וסירוס] וגדונות סרות E.
11 ואיננו] om E.
12 מת והלך לו] מות זהו הוזח טי לן סע צק E.

B^1B^2GH collated to A:

1–12 נוצר] נצור B^1.
3 וריחה] וריחן H. ותחרות] ותסרחות B^1GH, ותתרנות B^2.
4 והמסס] ומסיס B^2, add שהייה וזריזות B^1H, add שיחה ואילמות B^2G.
5 ורעבתנות] ורעבתן B^1G, ולרעבון B^2, ורעבון H.
7 וסריסות] וסריסות B^1GH.
9 וביטול כבד] וניטול כבד G, וביטול וכבד B^2.
12 וישיבה] ושינה B^1H, ושחוק B^2. ומעות] ומעוות B^1H, וניעור B^2.

Notes on the text of § 54

Like the similarly constructed §§ 36 and 44, § 54 is only found in the Long and Saadyan Recensions, while of our four early commentators only Saadya and Donnolo seem to know of it. For general comments on this block of SY material see the notes to §§ 36, 41 and 39–44. § 54 repeats the information found in § 52 with the addition

of the opposites of the bodily functions listed in § 45 generated on the pattern of § 37b. This set of opposites (סמיות, חרשות, etc.) is not listed in the summarising paragraphs 62 and 63. The vocabulary used shows that this material belongs to the latest stratum of the SY tradition.

The introductory rubric in the Long Recension is redundant in the Saadyan Recension which, as we have seen, places §§ 36, 44 and 54 altogether as a single block of material in its chapter eight. But if the Saadyan version preserves the original arrangement then the rubric will have been inserted when this material was separated out and assigned to different chapters in the Long Recension. See the notes to §§ 36 and 44 for the similar rubrics there. The summarising statement at the end of this paragraph in Ms E (זהו הוזח טי לן סע צק) may be related to the beginning of § 55 in the Long Recension. Unlike Mss C and Z Ms E inserts § 63 between §§ 54 and 55, and the scribe responsible for this may have felt the need for some summarising statement at this point. But note that Donnolo has a similar statement at this point which clearly relates to the emergence of the six chapter division of SY: זה ספר שלישי של י״ב אותיות הו זח טי לן סע צק (Castelli 1880: 76).

As in § 52 Ms D cuts out the structuring formula נוצר עם after the first sentence.

The vocabulary of SY § 54, especially in the list of opposites, introduces some rare words, some of which appear here for the first time in the Hebrew language. They clearly caused problems for some of the scribes and the result is a certain amount of textual chaos. Our guiding principle in the search for the original reading has to be that the structure demands that the final two items of each list should be words with opposite meanings.

Our problems begin with sentence three. Ms A's סרחות, unattested elsewhere, seems to be derived from the root סרח meaning "smell badly, stink", possibly a by-form of סרחון (bad smell). This is the opposite of what is required at this point. The reading תחרות (rivalry) in Mss CB^{1}GH is no better. Saadya knows of this reading and declares it to be an error along with סריות (garbage, stench) which he cites as a variant at this point, though it is actually present in Ms A's sentence seven as the opposite of תשמיש. According to Saadya the correct reading is תתרות which, on the basis of the occurrence of the word תתרנית in *b B.B.* 146a he says means "anosmia."[122] This is Donnolo's reading (Castelli 1880: 76). The derivation from תתרנית is reinforced by the reading תתרנות of Ms B^{2} – clearly another abstract noun formation from the adjective תתרן. It is not difficult to see how תחרות could have arisen by error from תתרות. There is no reading at this point in Ms D. Did the scribe leave it out in despair? Ms E's reading is hard to make out – תסכות (?), and it may be identical with Saadya's תתרות. There is a gloss in the margin: ״פי׳ סירחון (this means "bad smell") but it appears to be explaining E's peculiar reading (וגדונות סרות) in sentence 6 rather than anything in sentence 3. It is, however,

[122] Kafach 1972: 140, Lambert 1891: 102–103. See also Weinstock 1981: 36.

close to the reading of Ms A (סרחות). Where this reading in Ms A came from is a mystery.

The end of sentence 4 (שיחה ואילמות) is missing in Ms A though there is a blank space where these words should be. This raises the intriguing possibility that the reading in Mss B^{1}H (שהייה וזריזות) may have arisen from the work of a scribe who was copying a Ms which was ultimately dependent on A (or even A itself). He filled the lacuna with his own pair of opposites (delay and quickness). The rest of the Ms tradition is unanimous on reading סיחה/שיחה ואילמות. For the reading המסס (Long Recension Mss except for B^{2}) versus מס(י)ס (Saadyan Mss) compare § 52.4.

In sentence 5 Ms A's abstract noun רעבתנות or D's רעבנות seems preferable to the adjective רעבתן but the latter has the support of the Saadyan Recension Mss and B^{1}G. Some Mss prefer the biblical word רעבון (B^{2}H). Donnolo cites both רעבון and רעבתנות.

In sentences six and seven Mss Z and E (against all the other Mss) reverse the bodily functions in line with the order in § 45 but Ms C shows that this may have been a deliberate correction, possibly by Saadya himself.

In sentence seven Ms A's סריות cannot be correct as the opposite of תשמיש. ס(י)רוס (castration) or the abstract סריסות – possibly a new coinage, is clearly correct.

In sentence eight Ms C's ותגרות instead of וחגרות will be the result of the same error which produced ותחרות out of ותתרות in sentence three only the other way round.

The strange addition in Mss C and Z of ואיננו after ניטול הלב is not found in any other Ms. When Saadya explains ניטול הלב in his commentary he ignores this addition.

Something has gone badly wrong at the end of sentence twelve. Clearly Ms A's וישיבה is an error for וישינה but this itself could be an error for ושינה as in Mss DB^{1}H and ZE. Compare § 45 where Ms C has ישינה where A has שינה. What the opposite of "sleep" was in the original text is almost impossible to tell from the bewildering set of variant readings in the Mss. Ms D's קיצה obviously makes excellent sense but it would not explain how the variants arose so looks like an obvious correction, as does Donnolo's שקידה which he glosses with הוא עירות (Castelli 1880: 76).[123] But could the original reading have been a new coinage from the root עור with a prefixed Mem – מעורות perhaps, which then got corrupted to מעות in Ms A, ומעוות B^{2}, מוות (Ms C), מות (E), and מת (E)? B^{1}H clearly recognise the need for a word based on this root. Saadya struggles to make sense of the reading he has before him.

[123] עירות is also the reading of Ms Paris 763 which, although it does not have § 54, inserts this set of opposites at the end of § 37.

Sefer Yeṣira § 55

A

זה הוזחטילקסעצק וכולן אדוקין בתלי וגלגל ולב.

This is He, Waw, Zayin, Ḥet, Tet, Yod, Lamed, Nun, Samek, Ayin, Sade, Qof. And they all adhere to the Hook, the Celestial Sphere, and the heart.

B¹B²GDH collated to A:
B¹, זהו תלי גדול המזלות add [ולב זהו תלי גדול המזלות H.

C

וכולן אדוקין בתלי גלגל ולב.

And they all adhere to the Hook, the Celestial Sphere, and the heart.

ZE = C

Notes on the text of § 55

This paragraph is not present in the Short Recension. It looks like a duplicate of § 59a. In all the Mss of the Long Recension except for Ms A it appears again inserted between the two halves of § 60. It is also duplicated in that position in the Saadyan Recension at the end of § 60a; 60b does not appear in this recension. The paragraph order of chapter eight in the Saadyan Recension is as follows: 36, 44, 54, 55, 59b, 60a, 55, 61. It seems clear that the Saadyan Recension has simply reproduced the duplicate of § 55 in the Long Recension. It was lifted out of that recension with its associated block of material (§§ 59–61) and placed in chapter eight without the arranger of the recension bothering to eliminate the duplicate. Alternatively, he may have regarded the second § 55 as a replacement for § 59a which he had transferred to his chapter 1:4.

The gloss shared by B¹ and H is significant for their related ancestry[124].

Sefer Yeṣira § 56

K

אילו עשרים ושתים אותיות יה' יהוה צבאות, אלהים חיים, אלהי ישראל, רם, ונשא, שוכן עד, וקדוש שמו.

B²

שלש אימות שבע כפולות שתים עשרה פשוטות. אילו עשרים ושתים אותיות שבהן יסד יה' יי' אלהים אדוני צבאות אלהים חיים אלהי ישראל שדי רם ונישא שוכן עד וקדוש שמו. שני שמות יה' יה'. ארבע שמות צבאות

C

שבהן חקק יה וה אלהי ישראל אלהים חיים אל שדי רם ונישא שוכן עד וקדוש שמו שני שמות יה וה ארבעה שמות צבאות אות בצבאות שלו אלהי ישראל שר בפני אל אלהים חיים שלשה נקראו חיים אלהים מים חיים עץ

[124] See the Introduction § 8.1.

חיים אל שדי אל קשה שדי
עד כן די רם שהוא יושב
ברומו שלעולם ורם על הרמים
ונישא וסובל שנושא וסובל
מעלה ומטה שהכל נשואים
למטה ומשואן למעלה והוא
למעלה ונישא למטה ונושא
וסובל את כל העולם כלו
שוכן עד: שמלכותו עדי עד
ואין לה הפסק. קדוש שמו
ומשרתיו קדושים ולו אומרים
בכל יום קדוש קדוש קדוש.

אות הוא בצבאות שלו
אלהי ישראל שר הוא בפני
אל אלהים חיים. שלשה
נקראו חיים: מים חיים עץ
חיים. אל: אל קשה. שדי:
שעד כאן דיי. ורם שהוא
ברומו של עולם, ורם על
כל הרמים. ונישא שנושא
וסובל מעלה ומטה. שכן
דרך בשר ודם הוא למטה
ומשאו למעלה. והקבה' הוא
למעלה ונושא למטה.. והוא
נושא וסובל את כל העולם
כולו. שוכן עד: שמלכותו
עדי עד ואין לה הפסק. קדוש
שמו שהוא קדוש ומשרתיו
קדושים, ולו אומרים בכל
יום קדוש קדוש קדוש.

By them Yah Weh, the God of Israel, the Living God, God Almighty, *high and lofty, dwelling for ever, and holy is his name* (Is.57:15), carved out (the universe). Two names "Yah-Weh"; four names: "hosts" – it is a sign in his host; "God of Israel" – he is a prince before God; "Living God" – three are called living: the Living God, running water, the tree of life; "God Almighty" – a strong God who has been sufficient so far: "high" – for he dwells in the height of the universe, higher than the highest; and "lofty" – for he lifts and supports both above and below, for all who lift are below and what they lift is above, but he is above and what he lifts is below, and he lifts and supports all his universe; "dwelling for ever" – for his kingdom is eternal and has no end; "holy is his name" and his servants are

Three principal letters, seven double letters, and twelve simple ones: these are the twenty-two letters on which Yah, Yahweh, God, the Lord of Hosts, the Living God, the God of Israel, God Almighty, *high and lofty, dwelling for ever, and holy is his name* (Is.57:15), founded (the universe). Two names: "Yah, Yah"; four names: "hosts" – it is a sign in his host; "God of Israel" – he is a prince before God; "Living God" – three are called living: running water, the tree of life; "God" – a strong God; "Almighty" – so far sufficient; and "high" – for he dwells in the height of the universe, higher than the highest; and "lofty" – for he lifts and supports both above and below. Normally with human beings they are below what they lift, but the Holy One, Blessed be He, is above

These are the twenty-two letters [on which] Yah, Yahweh, God, the Lord of Hosts, the Living God, the God of Israel, God Almighty, *high and lofty, dwelling for ever, and holy is his name* (Is.57:15), [founded] (the universe).

holy, and every day they say to him, *holy, holy, holy* (Is.6:3)

and what he lifts is below, and he lifts and supports all his universe. "Dwelling for ever" – for his kingdom is eternal and has no end; "holy is his name" – for he is holy, and his servants are holy, and every day they say to him, *holy, holy, holy* (Is.6:3).

Z

(56a) שבהן חקק יה יוי צבאות אלהי ישראל אלהים חיים אל שדי רם ונישא שוכן עד וקדוש שמו.
(56b) יה שני שמות יָהּ וָהּ ארבעה שמות צבאות אות הוא בצבא שלו אלהי ישראל שר הוא מפני אל אלהים חיים שלשה נקראו חיים אלהים חיים מים חיים עץ חיים אל שדי אל קשה שדי שעד כָּן דאי רם שהוא יושב ברומו שלעולם ורם על כל הרמים ונשא שהוא נושא וסובל מעלה ומטה שכל הנושאין הן למטה ומשואן למעלה ום והוא למעלה ומשואו למטה ונושא וסובל את כל העולם כלו שוכן עד שמלכותו עדי עד ואין לה הפסק וקדוש שמו שהוא קדוש ומשרתיו קדשיו ולו אומרים בכל יום קדוש קדוש קדוש.

E collated to Z:
לפני]מפני E. יה יהוה]יה וה E. אל שדי שעד]אל שדי...כן E. כאן דיי אל קשה שדי גער בו E. סובל]נושא וסובל E. מדי 3º] קדושים]קדשיו E. יי׳ צבאות add E.

D

שלש אמות שבע כפולות שתים עשרה פשוטות. אלו הן עשרים ושתים אותיות שבהן יסד יה יהוה צבאות אלהי ישראל אל שדי רם ונישא שוכן עד וקדוש שמו. והן שני שמות יהוה שנעשין ארבעה שמות. יה הי וה הו. צבאות אות הוא בצבא שלו. אלהי ישראל שר הוא ישראל בפני אל אלהים חיים. שלשה נקראו חיים אלהים מים עץ. אל אל קשה. שדי. שעד כאן די. רם שהוא יושב ברומו של עולם ורם על רמים ונשא שנושא וסובל מעלה ומטה שכל הנושאים למטה הם ומשואם למעלה מהם. אבל הוא יתׄ למעלה ומשואו למטה. הוא נושא וסובל את כל העולם. שוכן עד. שמלכותו עדי עד ואין לה הפסק. וקדוש שמו שהוא קדוש ומשרתיו קדושים. ואומר לו קדוש קדוש קדוש.

B^{1}GH collated to B^{2}:
אלהים אדוני]om B^{1}. אלהי]אלהים...ישראל B^{1}GH. ישראל אלהים חיים B^{1}GH. אל שדי]שדי B^{1}GH. בצבא]בצבאות B^{1}H. פני אלהים]אל B^{1}. חיים 2º] om B^{1}. מים]pr שהוא אלהים חיים B^{1}G. שהוא יושב B^{1}.

S

אילו עשרים ושתים אותיות שבהן יסד יה׳ יוי׳ צבאות אלהים חיים אלהי ישראל רם ונשא שוכן עד וקדוש שמו.

LMNFPIQR collated to S:
ה׳ אלהינו אלהים]יה יי׳ L, הבה׳ יה יהוה MN, יי׳ אלהי Q. אלהים F, חיים] om L. ישראל] add אל שדי P. עד] add מרום PQ. שמו] add מרום וקדוש שמו MN.

Notes on the text of § 56

It is significant that this paragraph is missing not only in the Short Recension (except for one sentence = Gruenwald's § 51) but also in the oldest manuscript of the Long Recension (A). In the context in SY its second half (§ 56b) looks intrusive; it has none of SY's usual concerns or language but is composed of traditional midrashic material well attested elsewhere in rabbinic literature. It almost certainly belongs to that layer of expansionary material which characterizes the Long Recension. The slightly shorter Saadyan Recension (97 as opposed to 115 words) takes us a little way back in the process of the expansion of the text. Dunash does not have any part of § 56. Judah ben Barzillai has the single sentence (§ 56a) in the form found in Ms S as printed above (Halberstam 1885: 256). Functionally, the original (?) single sentence – § 56a, serves to introduce the conclusion of SY, a point made by Judah in his comment on this paragraph. He is then spot on when he cites the Long Recension version of this paragraph as coming from an early version which incorporates in its text "a little commentary" (*ibid.* 257). I am inclined to think that § 56a should be allocated to our earliest recoverable text of SY but its absence in Ms A and Dunash forces me to include it only in square brackets.

In the Saadyan Recension § 56 constitutes chapter 3:5, where it is followed by § 57, but in Saadya's own commentary (MS Z) the first sentence (= § 56a) is used twice elsewhere – in ch 1:4, where it is followed by § 58a, and in ch 2: 5, where it is followed by § 58b. This reinforces the conclusion which we could draw from the fact that only § 56a is found in the Short Recension, namely, that this is the core of the paragraph from which the rest has developed. The arranger of the Saadyan Recension clearly found § 56 next to §§ 57 and § 58 in his Long Recension source and has maintained these connections in his rearrangements.

There is considerable variation between the Mss in this paragraph not unlike those in the very similar § 1 and mostly due to the usual copying errors. No doubt scribes were also led astray by their familiarity with the sources of the material in the paragraph. The most significant variation is the use of the word חקק in the Saadyan recension where the Long and Short Recensions have יסד. Elsewhere in the work there is a clear preference for חקק as the primary word for God's creative activity; see especially § 1. יסד is found in § 14 but in the phrase ומשלשתן ייסד מעונו which is not present in the Saadyan Recension. The phrase recurs in § 57 but this paragraph is not present in the Short Recension. The verb יסד may have come into the manuscripts of SY under the influence of Prov 3:19 or Ps 104:5.

Two similar errors can be detected in Mss D and C. In § 56a D leaves out the divine name אלהים חיים but contains the comment on it in § 56b, so it must have been in its exemplar. Similarly C contains the midrashic explanation of the name יהוה צבאות but omits the name in 56a. אלהים חיים has clearly fallen out of Ms B^2 before מים חיים. What ומ stands for in Ms Z is unclear; Kafach does not include it in his text. The scribe probably began to write ומשואו, then realised his error,

stopped and marked it for deletion. C's נשואים is an error for נושאים as ZE show and ונישא is an error for ומשואו.

The additions at the end of the paragraph in the short recension Mss PQMN come from Isa 57:15. In Mss B^{1}GH the explanation of the epithet ונישא has become garbled by scribal errors; these readings have, therefore, been excluded from the apparatus. The reading in Ms E אל שדי שעד כאן דיי אל קשה שדי גער בו מדי is partly occasioned by an error in its exemplar (cf. CZ) which must have placed שדי after אל I^{0} when it should have read simply אל אל קשה as in the Mss of the Long Recension. The phrase גער בו מדי comes in from *b. Ḥag.* 12a. The explanation of ונישא got garbled in E as it does in B^{1}GH. E does, however, preserve the correct reading קדושים where Z has the error קדושיו.

Sefer Yeṣira § 57

A

שנים עשר למטה ושבעה למעלה על גביהן ושלשה על גבי שבעה ומשלשתן ייסד מעונו וכולן תלויין באחד סימן לאחד, ואין לו שני מלך יחיד בעולמו שהוא אחד ושמו אחד.

Twelve below and seven above on top of them, and three on top of seven. And from the three of them he founded his abode. And they all depend on one – a sign for the One who has none second to him, a King unique in his universe, for he is one and his name one.

B^{1}B^{2}GDH collated to A:
למעלה] om B^{2}GD. תלויין] add ועומדין B^{1}H.

C

ראיה לדבר עדים נאמנים עולם שנה ונפש. שנים למטה ושבעה על גביהן ושלשה על גבי שבעה ומשלשתן ייסד מעונו וכולן תלויין באחד סימן לאחד ואין לו שני מלך יחיד בעולמו שהוא אחד ושמו אחד.

A proof for the matter – trustworthy witnesses: the universe, the year and mankind. Twelve below and seven on top of them, and three on top of seven. And from the three of them he founded his abode. And they all depend on one – a sign for the One who has none second to him, a King unique in his universe, for he is one and his name one.

ZE collated to C:
ראיה לדבר] om E. שנים עשר ZE.

Notes on the text of § 57

This paragraph does not appear in the Short Recension or Dunash's commentary. Judah assigns it to the same expansionary version which contains § 56b and does not comment on it (Halberstam 1885: 257). Donnolo has an expanded, paraphrased version (Castelli 1880: 83–84). The Saadyan Recension prefaces the paragraph with a sentence which in the other recensions appears in § 58. § 57 offers an alternative understanding of the phrase ומשלשתן ייסד מעונו from that found in § 14 where the "three of them" seems to refer to "air, water, fire". In the context of § 57 it must refer to the three groups of letters of the alphabet. The effect is to bind together the

earlier and later parts of SY which seems to be one of the functions of this final chapter of the work – holding together its disparate threads. See the notes to § 12 for other examples of this editorial urge. The rest of the material in the paragraph comes mainly from § 48b. תלויין (instead of אדוקין which we find in § 48b) may be a play on the word תלי in §§ 55 and 59.[125] The weight of the evidence is against the reading למעלה in Mss AB^{1}H as is the parallel sentence in 48b. Ms C has omitted עשר after שנים through error.

Sefer Yeṣira § 58

C

(58a) שלשה א[בות] ותולדותיהן, שבעה כבושים וצב[אותי]הם, [ושנים] עשרה גבולי [אל]כסן ראיה לדבר [עדים נאמנים] עולם שנה נפש
(58b) ראיה לדבר עדים נאמנים עולם שנה ונפש. עולם ספירתו בעשרה שלשה אש ורוח ומים שבעה ושבעה כוכבים ושנים עשר שנים עשר מזלות שנה ספירתה בעשרה שלשה קור וחום ורוויה שבעה שבעת ימי בראשית ושנים עשר שנים עשר חדשים נפש ספירתה בעשרה שלשה ראש וגוויה ובטן שבעה שערים ושנים עשר שנים עשר מנהיגין

(58a) Three fathers and their offspring, seven dominant ones and their hosts, and the twelve diagonal lines. And a proof for the matter – trustworthy witnesses: the universe, the year and mankind. (58b) A proof for the matter – trustworthy witnesses: the universe, the year and mankind. The universe – its counting is by ten: three – fire, air and water; seven –

A

שלשה אבות ותולדותיהן ושבעה כבשים וצבאותיהן ושנים עשר גבולי אכלוסין וראיה לדבר עדים נאמנים עולם שנה ונפש עולם ספירתו בעשרה שנה ספירתה בעשרה נפש ספירתה בעשרה ועשרים ושנים חפצים יש בכל אחד. בעולם שלשה אש רוח ומים ושבעה כוכבים ושנים עשר מזלות. בשנה שלשה קור וחום ורוויה שבעת ימי בראשית ושנים עשר חדשים בנפש שלשה ראש ובטן וגויה שבעה שערים ושנים עשר מנהיגין.

Three fathers and their offspring, and seven dominant ones and their hosts, and the twelve diagonal lines. And a proof for the matter – trustworthy witnesses: the universe, the year and mankind. The universe – its counting is by ten; the year – its counting is by ten; mankind – its counting is by ten. And there are twenty-two objects in each one.

K

שלשה אבות ותולדותיהן ושבעה כובשים וצבאיהן ושנים עשר גבולי אלכסון וראיה לדבר עדים נאמנים: עולם, שנה, ונפש.

Three fathers and their offspring, and seven dominant ones and their hosts, and the twelve diagonal lines. And a proof for the matter – trustworthy witnesses: the universe, the year and mankind.

[125] Cf. Eleazar Roqeah's comment on this part of SY: נחש בריח הוא מזל תנין הנקרא בלשון חכמים תלי לפי שתלוים בו י״ב מזלות (cited in Harkavy 1887: 34).

Z

(58a = ch. 1:4) שלשה אבות ותולדותיהן, שבעה כבושים וצבאותיהם, ושנים עשר גבולי אלכסן ראיה לדבר עדים נאמנים עולם שנה ונפש (58b = ch. 2:6) ראיה לדבר עדים נאמנים עולם שנה ונפש. עולם ספירתו בעשרה שלשה אש ורוח ומים שבעה כוכבים שנים עשר שנים עשר מזלות שנה ספירתה בעשרה שלשה קור וחום ורויה שבעה שבעת ימי בראשית שנים עשר ירחים נפש ספירתה בעשרה שלשה ראש וגויה ובטן שבעה שבעה שערים שנים עשר שנים עשר מנהגין

and the seven planets; and twelve – the twelve constellations. The year – its counting is by ten: three – cold, heat and the temperate state, seven – the seven days of creation; and twelve – the twelve months. Mankind – its counting is by ten: three – the head, the chest, and the belly; seven – the seven exits; and twelve – the twelve principal organs.

D

שלשה אבות ותולדותיהן. ושבעה כוכבים וצבאותיהם. ושנים עשר גבולי אלכסונין וראיה לדבר עדים נאמנים עולם שנה ונפש. עולם ספירתו כב׳. שלשה אש. ומים. ורוח. שבעה כוכבים. שנים עשר מזלות. שנה ספירתה כב׳. שלשה. קור. וחום. ורויה. שבעת ימי בראשית. שנים עשר חדשים. נפש ספירתו כב׳ שלשה ראש. ובטן. וגויה. שבעה שערים. שנים עשר מנהיגין.

In the universe there are three: fire, air and water; and seven planets and twelve constellations. In the year there are three: cold, heat and the temperate state, the seven days of creation, and the twelve months. In mankind there are three: the head, the belly and the chest; and the seven exits, and the twelve principal organs.

B²

שלשה אבות ותולדותיהן שבעה כבשים וצבאותיהם, ושנים עשר גבולי אוכלוסין. וראייה לדבר עדים נאמנים עולם שנה ונפש. עולם ספירתו בעשרה שלשה אש מים ורוח שבעה שבעה כוכבים שנים עשר שנים עשר מזלות שנה ספירתה בעשרה שלשה קור וחום ורוויה שבעה שבעת ימי בראשית שנים עשר שנים עשר חדשים נפש ספירתה בעשרה שלשה ראש וגויה ובטן שבעה שבעה שערים(?) שנים עשר שנים עשר מנהיגין

B¹

ג אבות ותולדותיהן וז כוכבים צבאותיהן ויב גבולי אלכסון וראייה לדבר עדים נאמנים עולם שנה נפש עולם ספירתו שלשה אש ומים ורוח וז כוכבים יב מזלות שנה ספירתה בעשרים ג קור וחום ורויה וז ימי בראשית יב יב חדשים נפש ספירתה בי ג ראש ובטן וגויה זז׳ שערים ויב׳ מנהגין.

LMNSFPIQR collated to K: כבושים] כבושים LSFIQ^{mg}, אלכסוין] אלכסון Q*. ככבים LMNFPR, אלכסונן I, אלוכסין Q.

GH collated to A: כבשים] כוכבים G, כבשים כוכבים H.

E collated to C: בעשרה] add שלשה ושבעה E.

Notes on the text of § 58

In the Saadyan recension the material in this paragraph is found in two different places: in Saadya's chapter 1:4 (after § 45) = § 58a and in chapter 2:6 (after § 18) = § 58b. Saadya, however, as we saw in connection with § 56 repeats § 56a at the beginning of § 58a. Mss C and E do not have this addition, though it is present in British Library Or. 1263 in the Saadyan version which appears in fols. 3b–6a[126]. It must be significant that the Saadyan version splits the material at precisely the point where the Short Recension of the paragraph comes to an end. This suggests that 58b is an expansion of 58a drawn from material in §§ 29, 30, 43, and 48/9. However, the resumptive repetition of the clause ראיה לדבר עדים נאמנים עולם שנה ונפש at the beginning of 58b shows that the arranger of the Saadyan Recension must have had the Long Recension version of § 58 in front of him and felt the need to pick up and repeat the last sentence of § 58a before introducing § 58b. Nonetheless, the absence of § 58b in the Short Recension and in the commentaries of Dunash and Judah ben Barzillai indicates that it is likely to belong to the Long Recension expansion of the text of SY.[127] The "counting by ten" only appears in SY § 58b. It has the effect of binding together four of the five chapters of SY (chapter one = 10, chapter three = 3, chapter four = 7, chapter five = 12). As we have seen, that seems to be one of the basic literary functions of this supplementary Long Recension material.

The phrase שלשה אבות ותולדותיהן at the beginning of § 58a must be related both to § 27 and to the form of § 50 which appears in Mss MNFP. Unlike §§ 27 and 50, § 58a appears in all our texts, which creates a presumption that it belongs to our earliest recoverable text. In which case these other paragraphs look like an attempt to bring § 58 into harmony with whatever parts of §§ 27–36 lay before the editor of the Long Recension. Saadya faces the same problem in his translation and commentary on § 58 and has a neat solution which solves the problem at the drop of a hat: although the Hebrew text before him says שלשה אבות ותולדותיהן he translates it "three mothers and what originates from them" (ת׳לת׳ אמהאת ומא יתולד מנהא – Kafach 1972: 59, Lambert 1891: 31). Then in his commentary he justifies

[126] See the Introduction § 8.2. It is striking that in our restoration of the earliest recoverable text of SY we in fact replicate exactly what Saadya has in his chapter 1:4, i.e. §§ 56a, 58a, 59a.

[127] Donnolo has an expanded and paraphrased version of the Long Recension text of § 58 (Castelli 1880: 84).

his translation as follows: "I have translated אבות "mothers" in accordance with what I have said before that our words "fathers" and "mothers," "principles," "primary matter," "elements," and "basic substance" – all these have the same meaning." This is the same solution as the Mss MNFP text of § 50 and may indicate to us how that text arose. If, as seems likely, § 58a does go back to the original author of SY then the problem of its compatibility with the "three mothers" of chapter three (§§ 23–36) existed from the beginning. Perhaps Saadya's solution accurately reflects the author's thinking.

The repetitious nature of the language of § 58b created many opportunities for scribal errors, but in general the variations between the Mss which belong to the Long Recension and between the Long and Saadyan Recensions reflect deliberately different arrangements of the same basic material. However, only Ms A has the phrase ועשרים ושנים חפצים יש בכל אחד – probably drawn from § 22. This phrase seems to provide the basis for the unique arrangement of the material found in Ms D which, given its late date, may well represent an attempt to tidy up and provide a more logical structure for the more verbose form of the text found in the earlier Mss. Mss B^1 and B^2 contain minor errors[128] but both are closer to the form of the text found in the Saadyan Recension than they are to that of Ms A. H's reading כבשים כוכבים shows us how the reading כוכבים in Mss Q* DB^1 and G, arose – as a gloss on כבשים. No other readings of G and H are worth citing in the apparatus. Basically, they arrange the material like Mss B^1 and B^2.

Sefer Yeṣira § 59

C	A	K
(59a) [ח]וק עשרה שלש[ה שבעה ושנים] עשר ופיקודיהם בתלי גלגל ולב (59b) תלי בעלם כמלך על כסא גלגל בשנה כמלך במדינה לב בגוף כמלך במלחמה.	חק עשרה שלשה ושבעה ושנים עשר פקודין בתלי וגלגל ולב. תלי בעולם כמלך על כסאו, גלגל בשנה כמלך במדינה, לב בנפש כמלך במלחמה.	(59a) חק עשרה, ושלשה, ושבעה, ושנים עשה. ופקידים בתלי, וגלגל לב. (59b) תלי בעולם כמלך על כסאו; גלגל בשנה כמלך במדינה; לב בנפש כמלך כמלך במלחמה.
(59a) There is a law of ten, three, seven and twelve. They are officials over the Hook, the celestial sphere, [and] the heart. (59b) The Hook in the universe is like a king on his throne; the celestial sphere in	There is a law of ten, three, seven and twelve. They are present in the Hook, the celestial sphere, and the heart. The Hook in the universe is like a king on his throne; the celestial sphere in the	There is a law of ten, three, seven and twelve. They have command of the Hook, the celestial sphere, and the heart. The Hook in the universe is like a king on his throne; the celestial sphere in

[128] In Ms B^2 there is an illegible word after שערים which may be a dittography though it is not marked as an error.

the year is like a king in a province; the heart in mankind is like a king at war.

year is like a king in a province; the heart in mankind is like a king at war.

the year is like a king in a province; the heart in mankind is like a king at war.

LMNSFPIQR collated to K: חק] pr חיצה את העדים L. ושנים עשר] add מזלות L. ופקידים] MNIQR. ולב] L...R. בגוף] בנפש I. כמלך] כמלך כמלך L...R. כמלך בגוף] כמלך במלחמה כלומר במלחמה F.

B^1B^2GDH collated to A: חק] וזה B^1H.

ZE = C

Notes on the text of § 59

Again we find that the Saadyan Recension splits up the material of this paragraph into two parts: 59a is placed after 58 at the end of Saadya's chapter 1:4 while 59b appears in chapter 8:4 placed logically after § 55. Again it must be significant that the Short Recension also splits up § 59 at the same point inserting into it either § 25 (Mss KLSR and Judah ben Barzillai) or §§ 25–26 (Mss MNFPIQ and Dunash); see the notes to § 26. This raises the possibility that § 59b may have arisen as an explanatory gloss on § 59a. On the other hand, all our witnesses attest both halves of § 59, so the situation is not comparable to that which we found in the manuscript evidence for §§ 56 and 58. But if § 59 in its integrity, as it stands in the Long Recension, belongs to the earliest recoverable text it remains difficult to explain why all the Short Recension Mss inserted §§ 25 or 25–26 here. In the notes to § 26 we considered the possibility that the word חוק might be the link, but those Mss which insert only § 25 here are precisely the ones which do not have this word in that paragraph. The insertion of § 25 looks as though it might be starting an explanation of the three, the seven, and the twelve, but if so, why do we not find anything illustrating the seven and the twelve? There is no obvious solution to this problem.

There is only one significant variant between the Mss in this paragraph – ופיקודיהם\פקודין\ופקידין. פקודין makes the best sense within the overall thought structure of SY and has the most manuscript support – the numbers three, seven, and twelve are "counted in/present in" עולם = תלי, שנה = גלגל, and נפש = לב. It is easy to see how ופקידין could have arisen from פקודין, less easy to account for ופיקודיהם – though if it were written without the Yudh vowel letter, there would be only one letter's difference from פקודין, assuming an original plural termination in ים.

The reading בגוף in CZE (which appears in Ms I and in a garbled form in Ms F) replaces נפש which, as we have seen, is used in an unusual sense in SY – mankind. It may have arisen as an explanatory gloss.

Sefer Yeṣira § 60

C

(60a) כללו שלדבר מקצת אילו מצטרפין עם אילו ואלו עם אלו אלו תמורת אלו ואלו תמורת אלו אילו כנגד אלו ואלו כנגד אלו ואם אן אלו אן אלו

The sum of the matter: in some cases these are combined with those, and those with these; these are opposites of those, and those of these; these correspond to those, and those to these; and if these do not exist, neither do those.

A

כללו של דבר מקצת אילו נצטרפין עם אילו ואילו עם אילו. אילו תמורות אילו ואילו תמורות אילו. אילו כנגד אילו, ואילו כנגד אילו. ואם אין אילו אין אילו.
גם כל חפץ זה לעומת זה ברא אלהים טוב לעומת רע רע מרע וטוב מטוב טוב מבחין את רע ורע מבחין את טוב טובה גנוזה לטובים.

The sum of the matter: in some cases these are combined with those, and those with these; these are opposites of those, and those of these; these correspond to those, and those to these; and if these do not exist, neither do those. *So God has created every object, one opposite the other* (cf. Qoh 7:14): good opposite evil – evil from evil and good from good. Good brings evil to light and evil brings good to light. Good is stored up for the good.

K

(60b) גם כל חפץ זה לעמת זה ברא אלהים: טוב לעמת רע, טוב מטוב ורע מרע. טוב מבחין את רע ורע מבחין את טוב. טובה גנוזה לטובים ורעה שמורה לרעים.

So God has created every object, one opposite the other (cf. Qoh 7:14): good opposite evil – good from good and evil from evil. Good brings evil to light and evil brings good to light. Good is stored up for the good and evil is kept for the evil.

D

כללו של דבר מקצת אלו מצטרפין עם אלו ואלו עם אלו. תמורות אילו כנגד אילו. ואם אין לו אין לו וכלן אדוקין בתלי וגלגל ולב גם זה לעמת זה עשה האלהים טוב לעמת רע. רע לעמת טוב. טוב מטוב. ורע מרע .טוב מבחין את רע ורע מבחין את הטוב טובה גנוזה לטובים. ורעה שמורה לרעים.

LMNSFPIQR collated to K:	B^1B^2GH collated to A:	ZE = C
[ברא עשה MNFPIQ. אלהים האלהים L...Q. טוב לעמת P. ורע לעומת טוב add [רע שמורה MN. גנוזה [לטובים לצדיקים L. ורעה שמורה L. ורע לרשעים [לרעים S. גנוזה [שמורה	[גם pr וכולן אדוקין בתלי רע מרע B^1B^2GH. גלגל ולב. טוב מטוב ורע [וטוב מטוב מרע B^1B^2GH. add [לטובים ורע B^1, ורעה גנוזה לרעים ורעה B^2, שמורה לרעים ורע לרעים G, גנוזה לרעתם H.	

Notes on the text of § 60

The textual tradition of § 60 presents us with a real dilemma: the Short Recension only attests § 60b while the Saadyan Recension only has 60a with the result that no part of it is present in all our Mss. This suggests that the combination of the two in Ms A and the Long Recension is a later development. The fact that all the Long Recension Mss (apart from A) repeat § 55 (וכולן אדוקין בתלי גלגל ולב) between 60a and 60b confirms this. The creator of the Saadyan Recension found §§ 59b, 60a and 55 together and lifted them as a block into the end of his chapter eight. This raises the question as to whether § 60b could have arisen as an expansion of 60a based on the quotation from Qoh 7:14 and the last sentence of § 48a.

In § 60 and the parts of § 48 found in the Short Recension we seem to have a complex of material built around Qoh 7:14. Let us first of all assemble this material together:

§ 48a (Short Recension)	עשאן כמין מריבה וערכן כמין מלחמה גם את זה לעמת זה עשה האלהים.
§ 48b (Long Recension)	שלשה אחד אחד לבדו עומד שבעה שלשה חלוקין על שלשה ואחד חוק מכריע בנתיים שנים עשר עומדין במלחמה שלשה אויבים ושלשה אוהבים שלשה מחיים ושלשה ממיתים ואל מלך נאמן מושל בכולן אחד על גבי שלשה ושלשה על גבי שבעה ושבעה על גבי שנים עשר וכולן אדוקין זה בזה
§ 60b (Short and Long Recensions)	גם כל חפץ זה לעמת זה ברא אלהים: טוב לעמת רע, טוב מטוב ורע מרע. טוב מבחין את רע ורע מבחין את טוב. טובה גנוזה לטובים ורעה שמורה לרעים
§ 60a (Long and Saadyan Recensions)	כללו של דבר מקצת אילו נצטרפין עם אילו ואילו עם אילו. אילו תמורות אילו ואילו תמורות אילו. אילו כנגד אילו, ואילו כנגד אילו. ואם אין אילו אין אילו [וכולן אדוקין בתלי גלגל ולב.]

As we have already seen, § 48b in all Short Recension Mss is found after 60b, but it seems to be picking up and developing the phraseology of § 48a (underlined

above) – מריבה (lawsuit) and חוק (law), and מלחמה. But, as we saw in the notes to §§48–49, the Short recension version of §48a seems to be firmly positioned in all recensions and Mss (except LS and Judah ben Barzillai) as an early comment on the brief original sentence of §48a/49a.[129] §60b looks like a parallel development of Qoh 7:14 to §48a (Short Recension) or an expansion of it, picking up and slightly rewording the biblical quotation with which it ends.[130] When the Saadyan Recension was created §48a and 48b were situated together as they are now in the Long Recension because we find them together at the beginning of Saadya's chapter six.

We are faced with two alternatives:

(1) §§48a and 48b originally belonged together as part of the §§48–49 complex and a scribe of a Ms which is ancestor to all our surviving Short Recension Mss extracted 48b from its original position and moved it after 60b, not only because of the thematic connection (i.e. Qoh 7:14) but also because of the verbal link וכולן אדוקין to §55 which is inserted at the end of 60a in all Long Recension Mss except A. This would suggest that §60b existed well back in the development of the text of SY and that would raise the question as to why the editor of the Saadyan Recension chose to leave it out. A motive for its omission can be imagined: the editor could have disliked its ethical determinism which, as Joseph Dan notes,[131] would undermine the freedom of the will essential to the working of rabbinic Judaism. Judah ben Barzillai works hard in his commentary to show that §60b is compatible with rabbinic Judaism (Halberstam 1885: 262–63).

(2) The editor of the Long Recension found §48b after §60b where it is now in the Short Recension and moved it to §48 because he saw the verbal connections with §48a. But that would raise the question as to what the Short Recension version of §48 was doing in the §§48–49 complex in the first place. The complex deals with the "twelve simple letters" whereas the content of §48a (Short Recension) seems much more at home with §60 and the sort of summary material we find in this concluding part of SY. In fact the text of Mss LS and Judah ben Barzillai, by dropping out §48a (Short Recension form) entirely, leaves §§48–49 just dealing only with the twelve simple letters. Or do they witness to an earlier situation in which none of this material was connected to §§48–49? So another version of this second alternative could be that the editor of the Long Recension found §§48a (Short Recension) and 48b together next to §60 and moved them both to after §48 (original version as I have reconstructed it in the notes to §§48–49). But why would he want to do this?

It is hard, if not impossible, to choose between these alternatives. However, one conclusion we could draw is that the absence of a paragraph (i.e. §60b) in the Saa-

[129] שתים עשרה פשוטות חקקן צרפן חצבן שקלן והמירן וצר בהם מזלות וחדשים ומנהיגים – as reconstructed in Appendix III.

[130] Dunash's form of §60b maintains the exact text of Qoh 7:14 as in §60a (Short Recension).

[131] Dan 1993: 29.

dyan Recension might not indicate this time that it was not present in the exemplar of its editor. There are possible reasons why he might want to leave it out – it partly duplicates § 48a (Short Recension form) and its orthodoxy is questionable. On balance, I am inclined to the view that § 48a (Short Recension), § 48b and § 60b all originally belonged together as part of the build up to the conclusion of SY, though there still remains the possibility that 60b could have been a later expansion of § 48a. § 60a seems to be part of the major Long Recension expansion of SY.

The voluminous variants cited in Gruenwald's apparatus to this paragraph are nearly all mechanical errors occasioned by its repetitious language. The weight of the evidence (all the Mss except A) favours the reading טוב מטוב ורע מרע and with the clause ורעה שמורה לרעים at the end, though it is easy to see how the latter could have been added to an originally shorter text. The reading עשה for ברא (MNFPIQ, D) could be correcting in accordance with the text of Qoh 7:14, but more likely ברא represents the line of correction of SY which we discerned in §§ 1 and 20; all our texts have the verb עשה in § 48a. Ms Paris 763 has an interesting but idiosyncratic version of the latter part of § 60b: טוב מטיב ורע מריע. טוב מוחק את רע ורע מוחק את טוב (good does good and evil does evil, good wipes out evil and evil wipes out good). This demonstrates yet again the freedom the scribe of this manuscript felt to rewrite the text he was supposed to be copying.

Sefer Yeṣira § 61

C

וכשהבין אברהם אבינו צר וצרף וחקר וחשב ועלתה בידו נגלה עליו יי קרא עליו המקרא הזה בטרם [אצרך] בבטן ידעתיך וגו׳.

Z

וכשהבין אברהם אבינו וצר וצירף וחקר וחשב ועלתה בידו נגלה עליו הקבה׳ וקרא עליו המקרא הזה בטרם אצרך בבטן ידעתיך ובטרם תצא מרחם הקדשתיך נביא לגוים נתתיך. ועשאו אהבו וכרת לו ברית ולזרעו עד עולמי עד.

A

וכיון שבא אברהם אבינו והיביט וראה וחקר והבין וחקק וצרף וחצב וחשב ועלתה בידו [fol. 71a] נגלה עליו אדון הכל והושיבו בחיקו ונשקו על ראשו קראו אוהבו ושמו בנו וכרת לו ברית ולזרעו לעולם והאמין בייי ויחשבה לו צדקה וקרא עליו כבוד ייי דכתיב בטרם אצרך בבטן ידעתיך וגומר וכרת לו ברית בתוך עשר אצבעות רגליו והוא בשר מילה כרת לו ברית בתוך עשר אצבעות ידיו והוא לשון קשר עשרים ושתים אותיות בלשונו והקדוש גילה לו סוד משכן כמים דלקן כאש ריעשן כרוח ביערן כשבעה ניהגם בשנים עשר מזלות.

K

וכיון שצפה אברהם אבינו והביט וראה וחקר והבין, וחקק וחצב, וצרף ויצר, ועלתה בידו נגלה עליו אדון הכל והושיבו בחיקו ונשקו על ראשו וקראו אוהבו ושמו בנו. וכרת ברית לו ולזרעו לעולם. והאמין בייי ויחשבה לו לצדקה. כרת לו ברית בתוך אצבעות רגליו והוא ברית מילה. כרת לו ברית בתוך עשר אצבעות ידיו [fol. 38b] והוא ברית לשון. קשר לו עשרים אותיות בלשונו. והמקום גילה לו סודו. משכן באש כמים, דלקן באש רעשן ברוח, בוערן בשבעה, ניהגן בשנים עשר מזלות.

When Abraham our father observed, and looked, and saw, and investigated, and understood, and carved, and hewed, and combined, and formed, and succeeded, the Lord of all was revealed to him. And he made him sit in his lap, and kissed him upon his head. He called him his friend and named him his son, and made a covenant with him and his seed for ever. *And he trusted in the Lord, and he accounted it to him for righteousness* (Gen.15:6). He made with him a covenant between the ten toes of his feet – it is the covenant of circumcision. He made with him a covenant between the ten fingers of his hands – it is the covenant of language. He bound twenty[-two][132] letters into his language, and the Omnipresent revealed to him his secret. He drew them out into water, he burned them into fire, he shook them into the air, he branded them into the seven, he led them into the twelve constellations.

When Abraham our father came, and looked, and saw, and investigated, and understood, and carved, and combined, and hewed, and pondered, and succeeded, the Lord of all was revealed to him. And he made him sit in his lap, and kissed him upon his head. He called him his friend and named him his son, and made a covenant with him and his seed for ever. *And he trusted in the Lord, and he accounted it to him for righteousness* (Gen.15:6). And he invoked upon him the glory of the Lord, as it is written: *Before I formed you in the womb, I knew you, etc.* (Jer.1:5). He made with him a covenant between the ten toes of his feet – it is circumcision. He made with him a covenant between the ten fingers of his hands – it is language. He bound twenty-two letters into his language, and the Holy One revealed to him the secret. He drew them out into[133] water, he burned them into fire, he shook them into the air, he branded them into the seven, he led them into the twelve constellations.

When Abraham our father understood, (and) formed and combined, and investigated, and pondered, and succeeded, the Lord was revealed to him. He invoked over him this scripture: *Before I formed you in the womb, I knew you, etc.* (Jer.1:5). [Trans. of C]

M

וכיון שצפה אברהם אבינו והביט וראה וחקק וחצב ועלתה בידו נגלה עליו אדון הכל וקראו אהבו וכרת ברית לו ולזרעו והאמין בייי

D

וכיון שבא אברהם אבינו והביט וראה וחקר והבין וחצב וצרף ויצר ועלתה בידו נגלה עליו אדון הכל והושיבו בחיקו ונשקו

E

וכשהבין אברהם אבינו צר וצירף וחשב ועלתה בידו נגלה עליו כבוד ייי וקרא עליו המקרא הזה בטרם אצרך בבטן ידעתיך וג׳.וכולן עשאו

[132] The reading of all the other Short Recension Mss shows that ושתים was omitted here in error.

[133] I follow here in my translation the majority reading of the Mss – במים, etc.

אוהבו וכרת לו ברית ולזרעו עד עולם ועד עולמי עד.

בראשו קראו אוהבו. ושמו בני וכרת לו ברית ולזרעו עד עולם. והאמין בה׳ ויחשבה לו צדקה. וקרא עליו כבוד ה׳ דכתיב בטרם אצרך בבטן ידעתיך. כרת לו ברית בין עשר אצבעות רגליו והוא ברית מילה. וכרת לו ברית בין עשר אצבעות ידיו והוא ברית לשון. קשר עשרים ושתים אותיות בלשונו והקדוש ברוך הוא גלה לו סודו. משכן במים. דלקן באש. רעשן ברוח ביערן בשבעה כוכבים. ניהגן בשנים עשר מזלות.

ויחשביה לו לצדקה כרת לו ברית בין עשר אצבעות רגליו והיא המילה. ובין עשר אצבעות ידיו והיא הלשון. וקשר עשרים ושתים אותיות בלשונו. וגילה לו סודו. משכן כמים, דלקן כאש רעשן כרוח, בערן בשבעה, נתכן בשנים עשר מזלות.

B¹B²GH collated to A:

וחשב] pr ויצר B¹B²GH. [אדון הכל ונגלה] נגלה B². הקדוש ברוך הוא B¹H. אוהבי] אוהבי B¹, H. בשר ובני] ושמו בנו B¹H. לשון] ברית מילה G. ברית לשון] ברית לשון B², והקדוש] והמקום G. הנהיגן] משכן B². במים] כמים B¹B²GH. באש] כאש B²GH (B¹ err בראש). ברוח] כרוח B¹B²G, בשבעה] כשבעה ובכרוח G. בשבעה כוכבים] בשבעה כוכבים B¹B²H, G.

LSFR collated to K:

שראה] שצפה L. add] אבינו עליו השלום] והביט LS. ויצר] וצר SR. נגלה] om F. ושמו בנו] ושמו L. אז נגלה כשמו] עשר אצבעות L. אצבעות] עשרים LSFR. באש] עשרים ושתים LSFR. במים] כמים LSFR. מזלות] om LR.

NPIQR collated to M:

add] אבינו עליו השלום NQ. וחקק וחצב] וחקר והבין PIR. ויצר] וחקק וחצב וצרף om I. ולזרעו] וקראו אהבו P. add] אחריו המילה ברית] מילה PIQR. והמקום] הלשון PIQR. add] גילה PIQR. נתכן] נתנן N, נהגן כוכבים P. PIQR.

Notes on the text of § 61

In all the Mss of the Short Recension (except for K and R), and in the Saadyan Recension, § 61 forms the conclusion to SY. As we shall see, §§ 62–63 are clearly later additions. The textual evidence for this paragraph vividly illustrates our problem with comprehending the textual history of SY. Of our two oldest Mss, one has twenty-one words (Ms C), the other eighty-nine words (Ms A). There are two ver-

sions of the Short Recension, one represented by Ms K (plus LSFR) with seventy-eight words and another attested in Mss MN[134] and to some extent in Mss PIQR[135]. This has sixty words. Even within the Saadyan Recension there is no agreement among our three witnesses since Ms Z has thirty-six words and E thirty-three words. Which is earlier – the longer or the shorter version? Arguments can be supplied to support both positions but, on the whole, it is easier to account for the longer version as the result of successive additions to a core text than to see one of our two earliest Mss as the result of a drastic shortening of an earlier much longer text.[136]

Let us work through the paragraph phrase by phrase and try and isolate the core of the tradition and the source of the expansions:

(1) The three recensions are immediately distinguished by the verb chosen to begin the paragraph: צפה in the Short Recension, בא in the Long Recension and הבין in the Saadyan Recension.[137] There is no way of deciding which represents what the original author wrote.

(2) Next we have a chain of verbs, constituting part of the protasis before the single verb of the apodosis – "was revealed." The number of the verbs in this list varies from three in Ms E (צר וצירף וחשב) to eight in the Long Recension and some Short Recension Mss. Note PIR's addition of four extra verbs (וחקר והבין וצרף ויצר) to the four verbs in MNR (והביט וראה וחקק וחצב). Some scribes have clearly decided to throw in all the key verbs from the earlier parts of SY. But even the shortest lists do not provide us with a single verb which is attested in all Mss. So again, we cannot reconstruct an earlier agreed list of these verbs. My reconstruction simply takes the text of C but this expresses no confidence that its four verbs represent the original choice of the author. צר and חקק play a crucial role elsewhere in SY but CZ do not have חקק and MNQ do not have צר\יצר.

(3) The phrase ועלתה בידו is attested in all Mss. At least here we have testimony to a uniform earlier text.

(4) Again ניגלה עליו יהוה is in all texts. Three expansions – אדון הכל in the Short Recension and ADB^{2}G, הקדוש ברוך הוא in B^{1}HZ and כבוד ב' (DE) testify to a simple core reading expanded in different ways by enterprising scribes.

(5) The sentence והושיבו בחיקו ונשקו על ראשו קראו אוהבו ושמו בנו is not present in Mss CI. We can detect its growth from a two-word addition – עשאו אהבו (ZE) or קראו אהבו (MNPQR), to the six word והושיבו בחיקו ונשקו בראשו קראו אוהבו in Ms D, to the nine-word version found in the other Short Recension

[134] I have provided the text of M in the Apparatus, not only because of its distinctive form, but because the text of Ms K is contaminated with several errors.

[135] Their text is intermediate between that of K and M.

[136] Omissions by parablepsis would not account for all the differences. Mss S and B^1 show the type of text that results from this type of omission. S omits 1^0 בתוך...ולזרעו and B^1 ... 1^0 ברית וכרת לו.

[137] Judah ben Barzillai has בא in his first citation of this paragraph (Halberstam 1885: 99) but עמד in his two other subsequent citations (pp. 261, 266).

Mss and the Long Recension. B[I]H have an eight-word version with ובני instead of ושמו בנו.

(6) וכרת לו ברית ולזרעו עד עולמי עד. This sentence is found in all Mss except C so must belong to a very early stage in the growth of the text. Even the short text of Ms C implies the context of Genesis 15, so this is a natural theme for any Jewish scribe to add in at this point. Inevitably, then, Gen 15:6 gets drawn into most Mss but not CE.

(7) A reference to Jer 1:5 appears in the Long Recension and from there was probably transmitted to the Saadyan Recension. It is not present in the Short Recension or Judah ben Barzillai's citations of § 61. For its suitability in the context of § 61 see Liebes 2000: 209, n.8.

(8) The reference to "covenant" (6) leads to a considerable expansion which draws on SY § 3 : וכרת לו ברית בתוך עשר אצבעות רגליו והוא בשר מילה כרת לו ברית בתוך עשר אצבעות ידיו והוא לשון. This is not present in any of the Saadyan Recension Mss.

(9) The phrase לשון (ברית) at the end of this expansion is then itself expanded by the clause קשר עשרים ושתים אותיות בלשונו. Again this is not found in the Saadyan Recension. Shabbetai Donnolo's citation of § 61 stops at this point (Castelli 1880: 85) as does Judah ben Barzillai's first citation of the paragraph (Halberstam 1885: 100).

(10) סוד[138] גילה לו follows in the Short and Long Recensions but, as in (4) above, some scribes felt the need to provide an explicit subject for the verb – המקום or הקדוש ברוך בוא or הקדוש.

(11) The final expansion describes the infusing of the letters into the different elements of creation (משכן ... מזלות). This is another way of stating the point made by the two streams of Long Recension additions – המליך בו וג׳ (§§ 32–34, 41, 52) and נוצר נו וגו׳ (§§ 36, 44, 54). Functionally, this addition forms a fitting conclusion to the text, binding it all together. Since the Saadyan editor included both these earlier sets of additions it is difficult to understand why he would want to leave these final statements out of the conclusion to the book. It is easier to comprehend them as additions. It is probably significant that they are missing in Donnolo's citation of § 61 in his commentary (Castelli 1880: 85) while Judah describes this element as a "variant reading" (ואית דגרס׳). It may also be significant that a Piel form of the verb רעש appears for the first time here in the Hebrew language; otherwise it is attested only in medieval Hebrew.

If this is a correct account of how SY § 61 developed then the core text consisted more or less of that found in Ms C minus the biblical quotation from Jeremiah.

---

[138] Liebes 2000: 73 (and 290, n.14) accepts the reading יסודן here from the first printed edition against the evidence of all the manuscripts. Similarly, on the basis of what are almost certainly a couple of errors in Ms Q (דלקו for דלקן and בערו for בערן) he corrects the suffixes of all the verbs in the chain משכן...ניהגן from plural to singular, again against the evidence of all the other manuscripts.

The reading אז נגלה in Ms L reinforces the syntax implied in every other manuscript except C and B^2 – that וכיון...בידו is the protasis (when he came/saw/understood...) and נגלה the apodosis (then was revealed ...).[139] The addition of the Waw in B^2 (ונגלה) creates one long protasis with no apodosis. In Ms C a Waw must have been omitted before צר; otherwise the sentence cannot be properly construed. The syntax of this initial sentence is, of course, crucial for our understanding of the whole religious orientation of SY.[140]

In many Mss it is difficult to decide whether the reading is כמים/כאש/כרוח/ כשבעה or במים/באש/ברוח/בשבעה. The manuscript tradition clearly became confused about this at an early stage. בוערן in Ms K has some slight support in Ms S and probably R[141] but this is probably an error (Waw for Yudh). All the other Mss have either ביערן or בערן. The reading נתכן in Ms M is difficult to construe since the verb נתך (to be poured out) is always intransitive in the Qal and Niphal and is not attested in the Piel. N's reading נתנן (he placed them) makes better sense. It is not difficult to see how the one reading may have arisen from the other.

Sefer Yeṣira § 62

C	A	K
1 אויר ורוויה וגוויה ארץ קור ובטן שמים חום וראש. זה אמש.	1 אויר רוויה וגיויה, ארץ קור ובטן, שמים חום וראש זה אמש.	1 אויר וריוויה וגיוויה, ארץ קור ובטן, שמים, וחום וראש. זה אמש.
2 שבתי שבת ופה צדק אחד בשבת ועין ימין מאדים שני בשבת ועין שמאל חמה שלישי ב[שבת ואף] ימין נוגה רביעי בשבת ואף שמאל כוכב חמה חמישי בשבת ואוזן ימין לבנה [ששי] בשבת ואוזן שמאל.] [ז]ה בגד כפרת. [End of T-S 32.5]	2 שבתי שבת ופה, צדק אחד בשבת ועין ימין, מאדים שיני בשבת ועין שמאל, חמה שלישי בשבת ואף ימין, נוגה רביעי בשבת ואף שמאל, כוכב חמה חמישי בשבת ואוזן ימין, לבנה שישי בשבת ואוזן שמאל. זה בגד כפרת.	2 שבת, שבת, ופה, צדק אחד בשבת ועין ימין, מאדים שיני בשבת ועין שמאל חמה שלישי בשבת ואף ימין, נוגה רביעי בשבת ואף שמאל, כוכב חמה חמישי בשבת ואוזן ימין, לבנה שישי בשבת ואוזן שמאל. זה בגד כפרת.
3 [טלה ניסן כבד שור אייר ומרה תאומין סיון וטחול סרטן תמוז ומסיס אריה אב וכוליה שלימין בתולה אלול וכוליא שמאל מאזנים תשרי וקרקבן]	3 טלה ניסן כבד, שור אייר מרה, תאומין סיון טחול, סרטן תמוז המסס, אריה אב כוליה ימנית, בתולה אלול כוליה שמאלית, מאזנים תשרי קרקבן,	3 טלה ניסן כבד, שור אייר מרה, תאומין סיון טחול, סרטן תמוז משוש ארי אב כוליה ימין בתולה אלול כוליה שמאל מאזנים תשרי קרקבן, עקרב מרחשון

[139] The Leningrad fragment of the Arabic text of Dunash's commentary has עד נגלה (Fenton 1988:52), but this disrupts the syntax. עד is missing in the transcription of Dunash's text found in Moses ben Joseph's translation of this commentary (Vajda-Fenton 2002: 248).

[140] See Hayman 1989: 234, and 1991: 99.

[141] R reads בעורן – probably an error for בוערן.

[T-S (Glass) 12/813 begins] עקרב מרחשון קיבה קשת כסלו ויד ימין גדי] טבת יד [שמאל דלי שבט ורגל ימין דגים אדר] רגל שמאל .[זהו הו זח טי לן סע צק].

(1) Air, and temperate state and chest; earth, cold and the belly; heaven, and heat and the head. This is Alef, Mem, Shin.
(2) Saturn, sabbath and the mouth; Jupiter, the first day of the week and the right eye; Mars, the second day of the week and the left eye; the Sun, the third day of the week and the right nostril; Venus, the fourth day of the week and the left nostril; Mercury, the fifth day of the week and the right ear; the Moon, the sixth day of the week and the left ear. This is Bet, Gimel, Dalet; Kaf, Pe, Resh, Taw.

(3) Aries, Nisan, the liver; Taurus, Iyyar and the gall; Gemini, Sivan, and the spleen; Cancer, Tammuz and the gullet; Leo, Av and the right kidney; Virgo, Elul and the left kidney; Libra, Tishri and the intestines; Scorpio, Marheshvan, the stomach; Sagittarius, Kislev and the right hand; Capricorn, Tevet, the left hand; Aquarius, Shevat and the right foot; Pisces, Adar, the left foot. This is He, Waw, Zayin, Ḥet, Tet, Yod, Lamed, Nun, Samek, Ayin, Sade, Qof.

עקרב מרחשוון קיבה, קשת כסליו יד ימין, גדי טבת יד שמאל, דלי שבט רגל ימין, דגים אדר רגל שמאל. זה הוזחטילזסעצק.

(1) Air, temperate state and chest; earth, cold and the belly; heaven, heat and the head. This is Alef, Mem, Shin.
(2) Saturn, sabbath and the mouth; Jupiter, the first day of the week and the right eye; Mars, the second day of the week and the left eye; the Sun, the third day of the week and the right nostril; Venus, the fourth day of the week and the left nostril; Mercury, the fifth day of the week and the right ear; the Moon, the sixth day of the week and the left ear. This is Bet, Gimel, Dalet; Kaf, Pe, Resh, Taw.
(3) Aries, Nisan, the liver; Taurus, Iyyar, the gall; Gemini, Sivan, the spleen; Cancer, Tammuz, the gullet; Leo, Av, the right kidney; Virgo, Elul, the left kidney; Libra, Tishri, the intestines; Scorpio, Marheshvan, the stomach; Sagittarius, Kislev, the right hand; Capricorn, Tevet, the left hand; Aquarius, Shevat, the right foot; Pisces, Adar, the left foot. This is He, Waw, Zayin, Ḥet, Tet, Yod, Lamed, Nun, Samek, Ayin, Sade, Qof.

קיבה, קשת כסליו יד ימין, גדי טבת יד שמאל, דלי שבט רגל ימין דגים אדר רגל שמאל. זה הוא הו זח טי לן סע צק.

(1) Air, and temperate state and chest; earth, cold and the belly; heaven, and heat and the head. This is Alef, Mem, Shin.
(2) Saturn, sabbath and the mouth; Jupiter, the first day of the week and the right eye; Mars, the second day of the week and the left eye; the Sun, the third day of the week and the right nostril; Venus, the fourth day of the week and the left nostril; Mercury, the fifth day of the week and the right ear; the Moon, the sixth day of the week and the left ear. This is Bet, Gimel, Dalet; Kaf, Pe, Resh, Taw.

(3) Aries, Nisan, the liver; Taurus, Iyyar, the gall; Gemini, Sivan, the spleen; Cancer, Tammuz, the gullet; Leo, Av, the right kidney; Virgo, Elul, the left kidney; Libra, Tishri, the intestines; Scorpio, Marheshvan, the stomach; Sagittarius, Kislev, the right hand; Capricorn, Tevet, the left hand; Aquarius, Shevat, the right foot; Pisces, Adar, the left foot. This is He, Waw, Zayin, Ḥet, Tet, Yod, Lamed, Nun, Samek, Ayin, Sade, Qof.

R collated to K: B¹B²GDH collated to A: ZE= C

2 I⁰ שבתי] שבתי R.
3 המסס] מסיס B².
3 משוש] אריי המסס R. אריה R.

Notes on the text of § 62

In the Short Recension §§ 62–63 are found only in Mss K and R,[142] though Mss MNPIQ have a small part of § 63 in their form of § 48b. A Short Recension Ms not included in this edition (British Library Add. 27, 180, Cat. Marg. 733.1) also contains these paragraphs with a text almost identical with that of KR. Ms Paris 763 incorporates a form of § 62:2 after § 43a, 62.1 and 62.3 after § 48a, then a form of § 63 after בכולן in § 48b. The two paragraphs are present in all the Mss of the Long Recension but § 63 occurs only in Ms E in the Saadyan Recension. We have seen that the arrangement of the Saadyan and nearly all Mss of the Short Recension shows that § 61 was the original conclusion of SY. § 60 likewise (כללו של דבר) indicates that we are near to the conclusion of the text. Dunash ben Tamim does not have §§ 62–63 and Shabbetai Donnolo only has § 63. The absence of § 62 in Donnolo's commentary is significant since he usually follows the Long Recension version of SY. Judah ben Barzillai states that §§ 62–63 come from a version which incorporates commentary material into the text, similar to the additions to § 56.[143]

The contents of § 62 constitute a re-arrangement of material found in §§ 29, 30, 41, 49, and 52. Weinstock (1981: 34) prefers to put it in terms of the Long Recension having preserved intact here a block of supplementary material of the type which elsewhere it spreads throughout chapters 3–5 (§§ 23–64). He thinks that chapter seven in the Saadyan Recension (= § 62) shows that chapters five to eight of that Recension preserve the original arrangement of the supplementary material found in the Long Recension. The Saadyan Recension follows § 62 with §§ 36, 44 and 54 (= the first part of its chapter eight). This is quite a logical arrangement since these paragraphs all have the same literary structure (נוצר עם...) and they spell out which letters created the individual items of § 62. In Weinstock's view §§ 36, 44, and 54 would be a similar block of material to § 62 which has, like it, been split up and spread across the second half of SY by an editor of the Long Recension subsequent to the one who first incorporated this commentary material in the text. See the notes to § 36.

There is a disharmony between § 62.1 and the identification of אמש earlier in the text. In the Short Recension form of § 25 they are אש, מים and רוח, fitting the identity of *sefirot* 2–4 in chapter one (§§ 12–14). What § 62.1 lists as אמש are actually the "fathers" or the "offspring" of the "mothers". In other words, § 62 relates to that

[142] See the notes to Ms R in the Introduction § 8.3 for its peculiar layout of §§ 62–63.
[143] וכתוב בנוסח דראשונים שיש בה קצת לשון פי' (Halberstam 1885: 261).

secondary layer of material which we first identified in the Long Recension form of § 25 and which then appears in §§ 27, 35 and 50 (Mss MNFP).

The close relation between Mss K and R can be seen from the text of the colophon in each (§ 64). However, R would not seem to be a copy of K. Apart from the three variants recorded in the apparatus to § 62, there are differences in orthography. For example, in section 3 of this paragraph K's כוליה ימין is spelt כולייא ימינית in R, and כוליה שמאל becomes כולייה שמאלית. However, the orthography of words which they have in common like ריוויה and גיוויה suggests that this paragraph was a later addition at some point to the manuscript tradition from which they both descend. In § 29, 30 and 32 these words are spelt רויה and גויה. Suspicious also in K is the spelling of ארי and משוש. In § 49 they are אריה and המסס.

There are many variants in the Mss but they can all be fairly easily classified either as errors or minor differences in orthography.

Sefer Yeṣira § 63

	E	A	K
1	שלשה אויבים אלו הם לשון וכבד ומרה.	שלשה אויבים אילו הן לשון וכבד ומרה.	שלשה אויבים ואילו הן הלשון והכבד והמרה.
2	שלשה אוהבים אלו הם עינים ואזנים ולב.	שלשה אוהבים עינים ואזנים ולב.	שלשה אוהבים הלב והאזנים והעינים.
3	שלשה מחיים אלו הן	שלשה מחיים שני חוטמין וכבד של שמאל.	שלשה מחיין שני נחירים וכבד שלשמאל.
4		שלשה ממיתים שני נקבים התחתונים והפה.	שלשה ממיתים שני נקבים התחתונים והפה.
5	הידים והרגלים ושפתים.	שלשה שהן ברשותו ידים ורגלים והפה.	שלשה שהן ברשותו הרגליים והידים והפה.
6	שלשה שאין ברשותו של אדם אלו הן שתי עיניו ואזניו וחותמיו.	שלשה שאין ברשותו עיניו ואוזניו וחותמיו.	שלשה אינן ברשותו שתי עיניו ואזניו וחותמו.
7	שלשה שמועות לאוזן רעות קללות ובוז ושמועה רעה.	שלשה שמיעות לאוזן והן רעות קללה וגידוף ושמועה רעה.	שלשה שמועות רעות לאוזן קללה וגדוף ושמיעה רעה.
8	שלשה שמועות טובות לאוזן ברכה ושמועה טובה וקלוס.	שלשה שמיעות לאוזן טובות ברכה וקילוס ושמועה טובה.	שלשה שמועות טובות לאוזן ברכה ושמועה טובה וקילוס.
9	שלשה ראיות רעות עין נאפה עין רעה עין מגננת.	שלשה ראייות רעות עין נאפה ועין רעה ועין מגנבת.	שלשה ראיות רעות לעין נאיפה ועין רעה ועין מגנבת.
10	שלשה ראיות יפות בושה ועין טובה ועין נאמנת.	שלשה ראייות טובות בושה ועין טובה ועין נאמנת.	שלשה ראיות יפות לעין בושה ועין טובה ועין נאמנת.

11 שלשה לאוזן רעות הדובר
בפני רעו רע ואחד מלשין
ואחד המדבר אחד בלשון
ואחד בלב.
12 שלוש ללשון טובות
שתיקה ושמירת לשון
ומדבר אמת.

1 Three are hostile. These are they: the tongue, the liver and the gall.
2 Three love. These are they: the eyes, the ears and the heart.
3 Three give life. These are they:

5 the hands, the feet, and the lips.

6 There are three which are not in man's control. These are they: his two eyes, his ears and his nostrils.
7 Three things are heard by the ear and they are evil: cursing, shaming and an evil report.
8 Three good things are heard by the ear: blessing, a good report and praise.
9 There are three evil sights: an adulterous leer, an evil eye and a deceptive look.
10 There are three good sights: modesty, a good eye, and a trustworthy look.
11 Three things are bad for the ear: He who speaks evil in the presence of his fellow, he who slanders, and he who speaks one

11 שלשה ללשון רעות
הדובר בפני ריעו רע
והמלשין והמדבר אחד
בפה ואחד בלב [fol. 71b]
12 שלוש ללשון טובות
שתיקה ושמירת לשון
ומדבר אמת.

1 Three are hostile. These are they: the tongue, the liver and the gall.
2 Three love: the eyes, the ears and the heart.
3 Three give life: the two nostrils and the liver of the left side.
4 Three kill: the two lower orifices and the mouth.
5 There are three which are in man's control: the hands, the feet, and the mouth.
6 There are three which are not in man's control: his eyes, his ears and his nostrils.
7 Three things are heard by the ear and they are evil: cursing, blasphemy and an evil report.
8 Three good things are heard by the ear: blessing, praise and a good report.
9 There are three evil sights: an adulterous leer, an evil eye and a deceptive look.
10 There are three good sights: modesty, a good eye, and a trustworthy look.
11 Three things are bad for the tongue: He who speaks evil in the presence of his fellow, he who slanders, and he

11 שלשה רעות ללשון הדובר
בפני המלשין, והמדבר
אחד בפה ואחד בלב,
והמדבר יותר מדאי
12 שלושה טובות ללשון
שתיקה, ושמירת לשון,
ומדבר אמת.

1 Three are hostile and these are they: the tongue, the liver and the gall.
2 Three love: the heart, the ears and the eyes.
3 Three give life: the two nostrils and the liver of the left side.
4 Three kill: the two lower orifices and the mouth.
5 There are three which are in man's control: the feet, the hands and the mouth.
6 There are three which are not in man's control: his two eyes, his ears and his nostrils.
7 Three evil things are heard by the ear: cursing, blasphemy and an evil report.
8 Three good things are heard by the ear: blessing, a good report and praise.
9 Three sights are bad for the eye: adultery, an evil eye and a deceptive look.
10 Three sights are good for the eye: modesty, a good eye, and a trustworthy look.
11 Three things are bad for the tongue: He who speaks in the presence of the slanderer, he who speaks one thing with the

mouth but another with the heart, and he who speaks too much.

12 Three things are good for the tongue: silence, reticence, and speaking the truth.

who speaks one thing with the mouth but another with the heart.

12 Three things are good for the tongue: silence, reticence, and speaking the truth.

thing with the tongue but another with the heart.

12 Three things are good for the tongue: silence, reticence, and speaking the truth.

P

2 ובס׳א שלשה אוהבים העינים והאזנים והלב.
1 שלשה שונאים הלשון והכבד והמרה.
3 שלשה מחיים שני חוטמין והטחול.
4 שלשה ממיתין שני הנקבים התחתונים והפה. עכ׳.

D

1 שלשה אויבים ושלשה אוהבים לשון כבד ומרה.
2 עינים אזנים אזנים ולב.
3 מחיים שני חוטמין וטחול.
4 שלשה ממיתים שני נקבי מטה ופה.
5 שלשה ברשותו של אדם ידים רגלים ושפתים.
6 שלשה אינן ברשותו עינים אזנים ונחרים.
8 שלשה שמועות טובות לאזן ברכה שבח ושמועה טובה.
9 שלשה ראיות רעות לעין ניאוף גניבה ורעה.
10 שלשה ראיות טובות לעין בושה אמונה וטובה. שלשה ריחות רעות לאף נבאש קשה וסם המות. שלשה ריחות טובות לאף מזון וחריף וסם המות.
11 שלשה רעות ללשון רכילות ומלשינות ורעש[?]
12 שלוש טובות ללשון שתיקה ושמירה ודבר אמת.

R collated to K:

1 שונאים] אויבים והפה] R. 4 והאף R.

B^1B^2GH collated to A:

3 וכבד של שמול] om G, שמועות] שמיעות B^1. וטחול] שמועות B^1B^2H. 8 שמועות] שמיעות B^1B^2GH. 9 מתנבאות] מגנבת B^1, מגרת G, מתנבת H. 10 עין] בושה B^1H. יפות] טובות וריב] והמלשין B^2. 11 בושה בלשון] בפה B^1. המלשין B^1. 12 אמון] אמת B^1H.

Notes on the text of § 63

§ 63 is not present in Mss C and Z and, like § 62, only appears in KR in the Short Recension. Ms P has part of this paragraph inserted within § 48b and this develops the additional material in Mss MNFPIQ cited above in the apparatus to 48b. British Library Add. 27180 has § 63:3–4 in the margin alongside § 48, further reinforcing the connection between these two paragraphs; see the notes to § 48b. Dunash has a very similar version of § 63 to Ms P, also inserted within 48b but it is introduced as interpretation.[144] The scribe of MS P indicates that he is citing a sample from a more extensive set of material by prefacing his extract from § 63:1–4 with ובס'א (= ובספר אחר) and ending it with עכ' (= עד כאן). The connections between §§ 63 and 48b in these short recension Mss probably give us the clue to the origins of this material: it developed out of 48b. Like the previous paragraph it is clearly out of place here in SY between the original conclusion of the text in § 61 and the colophons in § 64. It falls into the well-known type of the numerical midrash attested as far back as Prov 30:18–31; see Aboth ch.5 and ARN ch.41. It is not too difficult to draw a line of expansion from the MNFPIQ addition after ממיתים in § 48b, to the longer addition in Ms P and Dunash, still connected to 48b, to the full form of § 63 as an independent paragraph in the Long Recension – but located in a position which (like the marginal note to Ms P) still clearly indicates its nature as supplementary, midrashic-type material.

The variants in the Mss of the Long Recension are mostly errors, so the apparatus is highly selective. Inevitably mechanical errors abound: E omits part of line 3 through to line 5; B[1] omits line 5; G reverses lines 11 and 12. Where the other Mss have והמדבר..בלב Ms D has a single word which is only partly legible. But Ms D has a strange text – partly abbreviated like its version of §§ 52 and 54, partly expanded like its unique development of sentence 10. Overall, it gives the impression that its scribe was aware of the nature of this material and did not feel as constrained to copy it accurately as other parts of SY. He obviously tried to amalgamate sentences 1–3 and then gave up at sentence 4. In sentence 3 D has טחול in agreement with Ms P over against KR and the Long Recension which have the rather strange reading כבד שלשמאל – strange because we have already had the "liver" in sentence 1. Are these manuscripts positing two livers?

In sentence 11 Mss K and R have an alternative version probably occasioned by the omission of ריעו רע after בפני in an earlier Ms. A subsequent scribe has then noticed that this left only two things "bad for the tongue" so has added the rather lame "he who speaks too much" in order to make up the requisite number.

[144] אחר כן פי' ואמ' (Vajda-Fenton 2002: 246).

Sefer Yeṣira § 64

A הדין ספר אותיות דאברהם אבינו דמתקרי הלכות יצירה .כל דצפי ביה לית שיעור לחוכמתיה.

This is the book of the letters of Abraham our father which is called "the Laws of Creation." There is no limit to the wisdom of everyone who looks into it.

B¹ הדין ספר אותיות דאברהם אבינו דמתקרי ספר יצירה.

This is the book of the letters of Abraham our father which is called "the Book of Creation."

B² חסלת ספר יצירה .הדין ספר אותיות דאברהם אבינו דמיתקרי הלכות יצירה .כל דצפי ביה לית שיעורא לחכמתיה.

The end of the Book of Creation. This is the book of the letters of Abraham our father which is called "the Laws of Creation." There is no limit to the wisdom of everyone who looks into it.

G חסלת הדין ספר יצירה אותיות דאברהם אבינו דמתקרי ספר יצירה .וכל דצפי לית שיעורא לחכמתיה.

The end. This is the Book of Creation – of the letters of Abraham our father which is called "the Book of Creation." There is no limit to the wisdom of everyone who looks [into it].

D נשלם ספר אותיות דאברהם אבינו עה׳ דמתקרי הלכות יצירה .וכל מאן דצפי ביה לית שיעורא לחכמתיה.

The Book of the Letters of Abraham our father (peace be upon him!), which is called "the Laws of Creation," is completed. There is no limit to the wisdom of everyone who looks into it.

H נשלם הדין ספר אותיות דאברהם אבינו דמתקרי ספר יצירה.

This Book of the Letters of Abraham our father, which is called "the Book of Creation," is completed.

K מי שיבין בספר זה וישמרהו מובטח לו שהוא בן העולם הבא.
זה ספר שלאברהם אבינו עליו השלום הנקרא ספר יצירה.
כל המעיין בו אין שיעור לחכמתו. וכל המתעסק בו ולומד בו ויודע סודותיו יתגלו לו סודות העולם העליון ועולם התחתון ומובטח לו שהוא בן העולם הבא. והדין ספר דמיתקרי סוד העיבור שכל העולם תלוי בו לא תימסר יהיה אלא למי שסר מרע וירא אלהים ומחכה ומקוה לקונו לפי שנאמר והבוטח ביי חסד יסובבנו ואומר יש׳ נושע ביי תשועת עולמים לא תבושו ולא תכלמו עד עולמי עד.

Whoever understands this book and keeps it has the assurance that he is a member of the world to come.

This is the book of Abraham our father (peace be upon him!), which is called "the Book of Creation."

There is no limit to the wisdom of everyone who looks into it. And the secrets of the upper and lower world will be revealed to everyone who occupies himself with it and studies it

and knows its secrets, and he has the assurance that he is a member of the world to come. This book, which is called the Secret of Intercalation on which the whole world depends, should not be handed over to anyone except he who turns away from evil and fears God and waits and hopes for his creator, as it is said, *steadfast love surrounds him who trusts in the Lord* (Ps 32:10), and it says, *Israel is saved by the Lord with an everlasting salvation, you will not be put to shame or confounded to all eternity* (Isa 45:17).

L נשלם ספר יצירה תהלה לאל נורא.

The Book of Creation is completed. Praise to the awe-inspiring God.

M הדין ספר יצירה לאברהם אבינו עה' דמתקרי הלכות יצירה כל דצפי ביה לית שיעורא לחכמתא ונשלם ברחמי שמיא דסייען חזק.

This is the Book of Creation of Abraham our father (peace be upon him!), which is called "the Laws of Creation." There is no limit to the wisdom of everyone who looks into it. It has been completed by the mercy of heaven which assists them with strength.

N הדין ספר יצירה לאברהם אבינו עה' דמתקרי הלכות יצירה .כל דצפי ביה לית שעורא לחכמתא .נשלם ברחמי שמיא.

This is the Book of Creation of Abraham our father (peace be upon him!), which is called "the Laws of Creation." There is no limit to the wisdom of everyone who looks into it. It has been completed by the mercy of heaven.

S תם ספר יצירה ונשלם .שבח ותהלה לבורא עולם.

The Book of Creation is finished and completed. Worship and praise to the creator of the world.

F שלם סי' הדן ספר דאברהם אבינו דמתקרי הלכות יצירה כל דצפי ביה לית שיעורא לחוכמתיה.
והדין דמתקרי סוד העבור שכל העולם תלוי בו .ולא ימסר אלא למי שסר מרע וירא אלהים ומחכה לקונו .לא כך נאמ' והבוטח בייי' חסד יסובבנו .יי' צבאות עמנו משגב לנו .ישראל נושע בייי' תשועת עולמים לתותעע'.[145]

This book is completed – the Book of Abraham our father which is called "the Laws of Creation." There is no limit to the wisdom of everyone who looks into it. This is called the Secret of Intercalation for all the world depends on it. And it should not be handed over to anyone except he who turns away from evil and fears God and waits for his creator. Is it not said thus, *steadfast love surrounds him who trusts in the Lord* (Ps 32:10). *The Lord of Hosts is with us, our refuge* (Ps 46:8). *Israel is saved by the Lord with an everlasting salvation, you will not be put to shame or confounded to all eternity* (Isa 45:17).

P הדין ספר יצירה לאברהם אבינו כל דצפי ביה לית שיעורא לחכמתיה.

This is the Book of Creation of Abraham our father. There is no limit to the wisdom of everyone who looks into it.

I סליק ס' יצירה תם תם תם בילאו.[146]

End of the Book of Creation. It is finished, finished, finished. Blessed be the Lord for ever, Amen and Amen.

---

[145] I.e. לא תבושו ולא תכלמו עד עולמי עד.

[146] I.e. ברוך יהוה לעולם אמן ואמן.

Q דין ספר יצירה לאברהם עה' דמתקרי הלכות יצירה .כל דצפי יתיה אין שיעור לחוכמתיה. נשלם ספר יצירה בסידור רב סעדיה גאון זל'.

This is the book of Abraham (peace be upon him!) which is called "the Laws of Creation". There is no limit to the wisdom of everyone who looks at it. The Book of Creation is completed in the version of Rav Saadyan Gaon (may his memory be for a blessing!).

R זה ספר שלאברהם אבינו עליו השלום הנקרא ספר יצירה .כל המעיין בו אין שיעור לחכמתו. וכל המתעסק בו ויודע סודותיו יתגלו לו סודות העולם העליון ועולם התחתון ומובטח לו שהוא בן העולם הבא.

This is the book of Abraham our father (peace be upon him!), which is called the "Book of Creation." There is no limit to the wisdom of everyone who looks into it. And the secrets of the upper and lower world will be revealed to everyone who occupies himself with it and knows its secrets, and he has the assurance that he is a member of the world to come.

Notes to § 64

This paragraph almost certainly has its origin in a note added at the end of the text by a scribe well back in the chain of transmission since its basic form is reflected in many Mss of both the Long and the Short Recensions. § 61 ends the text of the Saadyan Mss – undoubtedly the original conclusion of the work. The colophon was written in Aramaic and this clearly distinguishes it from the main text though scribes have other ways of making the distinction. For example, the scribe of Ms K placed his whole lengthy colophon in brackets in a block in the centre of the page while the scribe of Ms H placed חסלת at the end of § 63 before the colophon. The basic form to which there seem to be a restricted number of variations is:

הדין ספר אותיות/יצירה דאברהם אבינו דמתקרי הלכות/ספר יצירה [.כל דצפי ביה לית שיעור לחוכמתיה.]

The most distinctive variation is the much lengthier colophon in Ms K which is clearly related to the shorter form in Ms R. We have already noted the close relation of these two Mss in §§ 62–63. Ms F also reflects part of this addition. Mss Paris 763 and BM Add 27,180 also have colophons in this tradition, reflecting their closeness to K and R in §§ 62–63. All these manuscripts come from Italy, so it looks as though we have here an Italian tradition. Other manuscripts whose relation we have noticed earlier continue that connection in this colophon – B^{1}H and MN. The scribe of Ms Q is confused since he has certainly not given us the Saadyan Recension. The colophons in Mss LSI probably take us back to a stage before the standard form of § 64 evolved.

Bibliography

Bibliography Of Books And Articles On Sefer Yesira cited in the text

Allony, N.

- (1972) השיטה האנאגרמטית של המילונות העברית בספר יצירה, *Temirin* I, ed. I. Weinstock (Jerusalem: Mossad Harav Kook), 63–99.
- (1974/5) "Az minni 'ad ḥolalta", *Sinai* 75, 24–34.
- (1981a) ספר יצירה נוסח רס"ג בצורת מגילה מגניזת קהיר, *Temirin* II, 9–29.
- (1981b) "Zeman ḥibburo shel Sefer Yesira", *Temirin* II, 41–50.

Ben-Shammai, H.

- (1988) "Saadya's Goal in his *Commentary on Sefer Yezira*", in *A Straight Path – Studies in Medieval Philosophy and Culture: Essays in Honor of Arthur Hyman*, ed. R. Link-Salinger (Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press), 1–9.

Castelli, D.

- (1880) *Il commento di Sabbatai Donnolo sul libro della creazione* (Firenze).

Dan, J.

- (1993a) "המשמעות הדתית של ספר יצירה", in מחקרי ירושלים במחשבת ישראל, ed. J. Dan, 13, 7–29.
- (1994) פירוש ספר יצירה לר' יהודה בן ברזילי הברצלוני – אופיו ומגמותיו in *Masuut: Studies in Kabbalah and Jewish Thought in Memory of Ephrayim Gottlieb*, ed. M. Oron and A. Goldreich (Jerusalem: The Bialik Institute), 99–119.
- (1998) "Three phases of the History of *Sefer Yezira*", in his *Jewish Mysticism*, vol. I *Late Antiquity* (Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson Inc), 155–187.

Eleazar b.Judah b. Kalonymus Of Worms

- (1883) *Perush 'al sefer Yesira* (Przemysl).

Epstein, A.

- (1893) "Pseudo-Saadja's und Elasar Rokeach's Commentare zum Jezira-Buche: Die Recension Saadja's", *MGWJ*, 37, 75–78, 117–120.
- (1893) "Studien zum Jezira-Buche und seinem Erklaren", *MGWJ* 37, 266–269, 458–462.
- (1894) "Recherches sur le Sèfer Yeçira", *REJ* 28, 94–108, 29, 61–78.

Fenton, P.

- (1988) קטעים חדשים מהמקור הערבי לפירוש דונש בן תמים לספר יצירה, *Alei Sefer* 15, 45–55.
- (1998) פירוש קדום בערבית-יהודית לספר יצירה in *Mas'at Moshe: Studies in Jewish and Islamic Culture presented to Moshe Gil*, ed. E. Fleischer and M. Friedman (Jerusalem), 164–183.

Fleischer, E.

- (2002) "On the Antiquity of Sefer Yezira: The Qilirian Testimony revisited", *Tarbiz* 71, 405–432.

Goldschmidt, L.
– (1894) *Das Buch der Schöpfung* (Frankfurt).
Grossberg, M.
– (1902) *Sefer Yezirah ascribed to the Patriarch Abraham with commentary by Dunash Ben Tamim* (London: R.W. Rabbinowicz).
Gruenwald, I.
– (1971) "A Preliminary Critical Edition of Sefer Yezira", *Israeli Oriental Studies* I, 132–177.
– (1973) "Some Critical Notes on the First Part of Sefer Yezira", *REJ* 132, 475–512.
Habermann, A.M.
– (1946/7) "אבנים לחקר ספר יצירה", *Sinai* 20, 241–265.
Halberstam, S.Z.W.
– (1885) *Commentar zum Sepher Jezira von R. Jehuda b. Barsilai* (Berlin: Mekize Nirdamim).
Harkavy, A.E.
– (1887) אתליא – תלי , *Ben-Ammi*, April/May, ed. Y.L. Kantor (St Petersberg), 27–35.
Hayman, A.P.
– (1984) "Some Observations on Sefer Yesira : (1) Its Use of Scripture", *JJS* XXXV.1, 1–17.
– (1986) "Some Observations on Sefer Yesira : (2) The Temple at the Centre of the Universe", *JJS* XXXVII.2, 176–182.
– (1987) "Sefer Yesirah and the Hekhalot Literature", *Proceedings of the First Gershom Scholem International Conference on Jewish Mysticism, Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought*, VI, 1–2 (Jerusalem: Hebrew University of Jerusalem), pp.71–85.
– (1989) "Was God a Magician? Sefer Yesira and Jewish Magic", *JJS* XLI.2, 225–237.
– (1991) "Qohelet and the Book of Creation", *JSOT* 50, 93–111.
– (1993) "The Doctrine of Creation in Sefer Yesira: Some Text-Critical Problems", *RASHI 1040–1990 HOMMAGE À EPHRAIM E. URBACH: CONGRÈS EUROPÉEN DES ÉTUDES JUIVES*, ed. Gabrielle Sed-Rajna (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf), 219–227.
– (1995) "The 'Original Text': A Scholarly Illusion?", in *Words Remembered, Texts Renewed: Essays in Honour of John F.A. Sawyer*, ed. J Davies, G Harvey & W E G Watson (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press), 434–449.
– (2004) "The Dragon, the *Axis Mundi*, and *Sefer Yeṣira* §59" (forthcoming) (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag).
Jospe, R.
– (1990) "Early Philosophical Commentaries on the *Sefer Yezirah*: Some Comments", *REJ* 149, 369–415.
Kafach, J. D.
– (1972) ספר יצירה השלם עם תרגום ופירוש רבנו סעדיה גאון (Jerusalem: Dror).
Lambert, M.
– (1891) *Commentaire sur le Séfer Yesira ou livre de la creation par le Gaon Saadya de Fayyoum* (Paris: Émile Bouillon; reprinted 1986 Alençon: Editions Bibliophane – French trans. only).
Langerman, Y.T.
– (1997) "A New Edition of *Sefer Yesira*?", *Kabbalah* 2, 49–64.
Liebes, Y.
– (2000) תורת היצירה של ספר יצירה (English title: *Ars Peotica in Sefer Yetsira*) (Tel-Aviv, Schocken).

Pines, S
– (1989) "Points of Similarity between the Exposition of the Doctrine of the Sefirot in Sefer Yezira and a Text of the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies", *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities*, vol. VII.3, 63–142.
Scholem, G.
– (1990) *Origins of the Kabbalah*, Trans. A. Arkush (Princeton: JPSA and Princeton University Press), 24–35. Trans. of *Ursprung und Anfänge der Kabbala* (Berlin 1962).
– (1971) "Yezirah, Sefer", *EJ* XVI, 782–788.
Séd, N.
– (1966) "Le Memar samaritain, le Sefer Yesira et les trente-deux sentiers de la sagesse", *RHR* 170, 159–84.
– (1973) "Le Sēfer Yeṣīrā: l'édition critique, le texte primitif, la grammaire et la métaphysique", *REJ* 132, 513–528.
Sefer Yesira
– (1562) (Mantua). The first printed edition.
Vajda, G.
– (1954) "Nouveaux fragments arabes du commentaire de Dunash b. Tamim sur le Livre de la Création", *REJ* 113, 37–61.
– (1959–60) "Sa'adya commentateur du 'Livre de la Création'," *Annuaire de l'Ecole Pratique des Hautes Études, Sciences Religieuses* (Paris), 3–35.
– (1963) "Deux nouveaux fragments arabes du commentaire de Dunash b.Tamim sur le Sefer Yesira", *REJ* 122, 149–162.
Vadja, G. and Fenton, P.B.
– (2002) *Le Commentaire sur le Livre de la Création de Dūnaš ben Tāmīn de Kairouan (X^e siècle): Nouvelle édition revue et augmentée par Paul B. Fenton* (Paris-Louvain: Peters)
Wasserstrom, S.M.
– (1993:) "Sefer Yeṣira and Early Islam: A Reappraisal", *Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 3, 1–30.
Weinstock, I.
– (1972) לברור הנוסח של ספר יצירה, *Temirin* I, ed. I. Weinstock (Jerusalem: Mossad Harav Kook), 9–71.
– (1981) להבהרת אופיו וגילגוליו של ספר יצירה שב'נוסח רס'ג', Temirin, II, 31–39.

General Bibliography

Abrams, D.
– (1994) *The Book Bahir: An Edition Based on the Earliest Manuscripts* (Los Angeles: Cherub Press).
Albeck, C.
– (1940) *Midraš Berešit Rabbati ex libro R. Mosis Haddaršan* (Jerusalem: Mekize Nirdamim).
Altmann, A., and Stern, S.M.
– (1958) *Isaac Israeli: A Neoplatonic Philosopher of the Early Tenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
Barton, T.
– (1994) *Ancient Astronomy* (London and New York: Routledge).
Beit-Arié, M

- (1986/87) "Palaeographical Identification of Hebrew Manuscripts: Methodology and Practice", *JA* 12–13, 15–44. Reprinted with additions and corrections in Beit-Arié 1993b, 11–40.
- (1993a) *Hebrew Manuscripts of East and West: Towards a Comparative Codicology* (London: The British Library).
- (1993b) *The Makings of the Medieval Hebrew Book* (Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, The Hebrew University).
- (1993c) "Transmission of Texts by Scribes and Copyists: Unconscious and Critical Interferences", *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 75.3, 33–51.
- (1994) *Catalogue of the Hebrew manuscripts in the Bodleian Library and in the College Libraries of Oxford*: supplement of addenda and corrigenda to vol. I (A. Neubauer's catalogue), compiled under the direction of Malachi Beit-Arié; edited by R.A. May (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Buber, S.
- (1884) *Lekach Tob (Pesikta Sutarta), ein agadischer Commentar zum ersten und zweiten Buche Moses von R. Tobia ben Elieser* (Wilna).
- (1885) *Midrash Tanḥuma* (Wilna).

Cassel, D.
- (1869) *Das Buch Kusari des Jehuda ha-Levi nach dem hebräischen Texte des Jehuda Ibn-Tibbon* (Leipzig).

Cohen, M.S.
- (1983) *The Shi'ur Qomah: Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism* (Lanham, New York, London: University Press of America).

Dan, J.
- (1993b) "The Ancient Hekhalot Texts in the Middle Ages: Tradition, Source, Inspiration", *BJRL* 75.3, 83–96, reprinted in Dan 1998: 243–260.

Ganz, S.
- (1948/49) "The Origin of the Planetary Week *or* The Planetary Week in Hebrew Literature", *Proceedings of the American Academy of Jewish Research* 18, 213–254.

Grätz, H.
- (1846 (1971) *Gnosticismus und Judentum* (Krotoschin: B.L. Monasch und Sohn, repr. Farnborough U.K.: Gregg International Publishers).

Gruenwald, I.
- (1972) "ראויות יחזקאלת, מהדורה ביקורית ופירוש" in *Temirin* I, ed. I. Weinstock (Jerusalem: Mossad Harav Kook), 101–139.

Guthrie, W.K.C.
- (1962–1980) *A History of Greek Philosophy*, 6 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Halperin, D.J.
- (1988) *The Faces of the Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel's Vision*, TSAJ 16 (Tübingen: J.C.B.Mohr)

Herford, R. T.
- (1962) *The Ethics of the Talmud: Sayings of the Fathers* (New York: Schocken).

Hermann, K.
- (1993) "Re-written Mystical Texts: the Transmission of the Heikhalot Literature in the Middle Ages", *BJRL* 75.3, 97–116.

Horovitz, H.S.
- (1966) *Siphre D'Be Rab* (Jerusalem: Wahrmann Books).

Lasker, D.J.
- (1992) "*Qiṣṣa Mujādalat al-Usquf* and *Neṣṭor Ha-Komer*: The earliest Arabic and Hebrew Jewish anti-Christian polemics", in *Genizah research after ninety years: The case of Judaeo-Arabic*, ed. Joshua Blau and Stefan C. Reif (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 112–118.

Malter, H.
- (1921) *Saadya Gaon: His Life and Works* (Philadelphia: JPSA of America).

Mandelbaum, B.
- (1987) *Pirke de Rav Kahana* (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America).

Marmorstein, A.
- (1927) *The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God* (London).

Margoliouth, G.
- (1899–1935) *Catalogue of the Hebrew and Samaritan Manuscripts in the British Museum*, 4 vols. (London).

Neubauer, A.
- (1886) *Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

O'Neill, J.C.
- (1991) "The Lost Written Records of Jesus' Words and Deeds Behind our Records", JTS 42, 483–504.

Richler, B And Beit-arié, M
- (2001) *Hebrew Manuscripts in the Biblioteca Palatina in Parma* (Jerusalem: JNUL).

Sáenz-Badillos, A
- (1993) *A History of the Hebrew Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Sirat, C.
- (1990) *A History of Jewish Philosophy in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Schäfer, P
- (1981) *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur*, TSAJ 2 (Tübingen: J.C.B.Mohr).
- (1984) *Geniza Fragmente zur Hekhalot-Literatur*, TSAJ 6 (Tübingen: J.C.B.Mohr).
- (1988) *Hekhalot-Studien*, TSAJ 19 (Tübingen: J.C.B.Mohr).
- (1989) *Übersetzung der Hekhalot Literature*, vol. III, TSAJ 22 (Tübingen: J.C.B.Mohr).
- (1991) *Synopse zum Talmud Yerushalmi*, Band I/1–2, TSAJ 31 (Tübingen: J.C.B.Mohr)
- (1995) "The Magic of the Golem: The Early Development of the Golem Legend", *JJS* 46, 249–261.

Séd, N.
- (1981) *La mystique cosmologique juive, Études* juives XVI (Paris: Éditions de l'École des Hautes Études/Mouton).

Scholem, G
- (1962) *Ursprung und Änfange der Kabbala* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co). English translation by A. Arkush, *Origins of the Kabbalah (*Princeton: Princeton University Press and the Jewish Publication Society of America), 1987/1990 (= Scholem 1987).

Schlüter, M.
- (1982) *"Deraqon" und Götzendienst: Studien zur antiken jüdischen Religionsgeschichte, ausgehend von einem griechischen Lehnwort in m AZ III 3* (Judentum und Umwelt, 4; Frankfurt: Peter Lang).

Sharf, A.
- (1976) *The Universe of Shabbetai Donnolo* (Warminster: Aris & Phillips).

Sirat, C.
- (1990) *A History of Jewish Philosophy in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- (2002) *Hebrew Manuscripts of the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Stec, D.M.
- (1994) *The Text of the Targum of Job: An Introduction and Critical Edition*, Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums, XX (Leiden: E.J.Brill).

Stroumsa, S.
- (1992) "*Qiṣṣa Mujādalat al-Usquf*: A case study in polemical literature", in *Genizah research after ninety years: The case of Judaeo-Arabic*, ed. Joshua Blau and Stefan C. Reif (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 155–159.

Ta-Shma, I.M.
- (1971) "Judah ben Barzillai", *EJ* X, 341–2.

Tov, E.
- (1985) "The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical Manuscripts", *JSOT* 31, 3–29.

Urbach, E.E.
- (1979) *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs* (Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, the Hebrew University).

Yardeni, A.
- (1977) *The Book of Hebrew Script: History, Palaeography, Script Styles, Calligraphy and Design* (Jerusalem: Carta).

Zotenberg, H.
- (1866) *Catalogues des manuscrits Hébreux et Samaritains, Fonds Hébreu* (Paris).

Index of Sources

1. Hebrew Bible

Genesis

1,1 34, 62
1,2 86
2,4 114
15,6 182, 185

Deuteronomy

4,15 73
33,27 150

Isaiah

6,3 170
26,4 61, 77, 103
34,11 86
45,7 34, 130
47,15 194
57,15 59, 169, 172
57,20 34, 86
64,3 34, 136

Jeremiah

1,5 182, 185

Ezekiel

1,14 34, 72, 73, 78, 89
3,12 131

Amos

4,13 63

Psalms

32,10 194
46,8 194
93,2 80, 82
104,4 34, 87, 89
104,5 171
119,129 63

Job

9,6 108
26,7 34, 66
26,11 108
37,6 85, 87

Proverbs

3,19 171
9,1 108
30,18–31 192

Song of Songs

6,2 86

Qohelet

7,14 34, 36, 62, 151, 158, 178–181

Esther

5:11 63

Daniel

1,4 63
12,6 63

II Chronicles

2,16 63

2. Rabbinic literature

b. Shabb
20b 136

b. RH
27a 136

y. Ḥag
77 35, 85, 86, 103

b. Ḥag
12 35, 61, 85, 86, 105, 143, 150, 172

b.BB
146a 166

Aboth
5 192

b. Men
29b 35, 138

ARN[A]
37 143
41 192

Sifre Numbers (ed. Horovitz)
100 136

Ber. R.
1,5 105
1,15 87
4,7 105

Tanḥuma
Way[e]ḥi 17 34

Lekach Tob (ed. Buber)
p. 2 77

Moshe ha-Darshan Bereshit Rabbati (ed. Albeck)
p. 1f 30

3. Hekhalot and related texts

Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur
§39 (III Enoch) 136
§949 (Shiur Qoma) 136

Visions of Ezekiel
1,51 136

Index of Modern Authors

Abrams, D. 10
Albeck, C. 30
Allony, N. 3, 4, 13, 18, 19, 32, 71, 73, 75, 84, 95, 97, 100, 102, 125, 151, 162
Altmann, A. 29

Barton, T. 128
Beit-Arié, M. 6, 7, 9, 12, 13, 21, 23
Ben-Shammai, H. 26, 68, 124
Berliner, A. 8
Blau, J. 8
Buber, S. 34

Cassel, D. 144
Castelli, D. 31, 61, 65, 68, 73, 78, 88, 90, 95, 103, 108, 116, 117, 119, 120, 125, 126, 130, 132, 134, 138, 143, 157, 162, 166, 172, 175, 185
Cohen, M.S. 136

Dan, J. 8, 25, 32, 35, 37, 66, 77, 124, 138, 139, 180

Epstein, A. 2, 26, 30–32, 37, 39, 95, 100, 113, 120, 143

Fenton, P. 1, 25, 29, 60, 63, 64, 66, 68, 71, 80, 84, 91, 95, 103, 113, 120, 123, 134, 138, 143, 147, 156, 158, 186, 192
Friedman, M. 25

Ganz, S. 36, 143
Goldreich, A. 32
Goldschmidt, L. 3, 37, 117, 123, 125, 126, 133
Grossberg, M. 29, 60, 63, 71, 84, 129
Gruenwald, I. 3–5, 9, 11–17, 21, 22, 24, 33, 34, 37–39, 62–65, 69–71, 73, 77, 80, 81, 84, 86–88, 91, 97, 108, 113, 115, 135, 139, 143, 150, 155, 159, 171, 181

Guthrie, W.K.C. 113, 114.

Haberman, A.M. 1–3, 13, 18, 24 –26, 28
Halberstam, S.Z.W. 21, 24, 25, 32, 61, 63, 65, 66, 69, 71, 73, 75, 95, 103, 106, 109, 113, 116, 117, 120, 125, 130, 132, 134, 143, 149, 150, 157, 159, 171, 172, 180, 184, 185, 188
Halperin, D.J. 136, 143
Harkavy, A.E. 36, 173
Hayman, A.P. 9, 34 –36, 61, 62, 69, 71, 82, 86, 89, 105, 106, 132, 150, 186
Herford, R.T. 7
Hermann, K. 8
Horovitz, H.S. 136

Jospe, R. 26

Kafach, J.D. 1, 13, 19, 26, 61, 63, 66, 68, 73, 84, 96, 100, 102, 106, 116, 166, 171, 175
Kantor, Y.L. 36
Kaufmann, D. 32

Lambert, M. 1, 13, 19, 26, 61, 63, 66, 68, 73, 84, 96, 100, 102, 106, 116, 166, 171, 175
Langerman, Y.T. 20
Lasker, D. 8
Liebes, Y. 4, 35, 62, 71, 73, 84, 88, 98, 113, 114, 124, 132, 150, 185
Link-Salinger, R. 26

Malter, H. 26
Mandelbaum, B. 145
Margoliouth, G. 12–14
Marmorstein, A. 73

Neubauer, A. 12

O'Neill, J.C. 7
Oron, M. 32

Pines, S. 82, 132

Reif, S. 8, 41
Richler, B. 13

Saenz-Badillos, A. 66
Schäfer, P. 9, 12, 13, 102
Schlosberg, L. 8
Scholem, G. 3, 66, 97
Schlüter, M. 36
Séd, N. 3, 36, 69, 95, 143
Sharf, A. 31, 36
Sirat, C. 13, 22, 28
Stec, D. 11
Stern, S.M. 29
Stroumsa, S. 8

Ta-Shma, I.M. 32
Tov, E. 33, 144

Urbach, E.E. 73, 132

Vajda, G. 1, 26, 29, 60, 63, 64, 71, 109, 120, 123, 132, 134, 138, 143, 147, 156, 158, 186, 192

Wasserstrom, S. 95
Weinstock, I. 2, 4–6, 14, 18, 20, 22, 25, 27, 38, 39, 61–65, 69–71, 73, 75, 78, 80–82, 84, 87, 97, 100, 102, 126, 129, 148, 166, 188

Yardeni, A. 13

Zotenberg, H. 13, 14, 22

Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism

Alphabetical Index

Albani, M., J. Frey, A. Lange (Ed.): Studies in the Book of Jubilees. 1997. *Volume 65.*

Ameling, Walter: Inscriptiones Iudaicae Orientis. Vol. 2: Kleinasien. 2004. *Volume 99.*

Avemarie, Friedrich: Tora und Leben. 1996. *Volume 55.*

Becker, A. H., A. Y. Reed (Ed.): The Ways that Never Parted. 2003. *Volume 95.*

Becker, Hans-Jürgen: Die großen rabbinischen Sammelwerke Palästinas. 1999. *Volume 70.*

– see *Schäfer, Peter*

Bloedhorn, Hanswulf: see *Noy, David*

Cansdale, Lena: Qumran and the Essenes. 1997. *Volume 60.*

Chester, Andrew: Divine Revelation and Divine Titles in the Pentateuchal Targumim. 1986. *Volume 14.*

Cohen, Martin Samuel: The Shi ur Qomah: Texts and Recensions. 1985. *Volume 9.*

Crown, Alan D.: Samaritan Scribes and Manuscripts. 2001. *Volume 80.*

Doering, Lutz: Schabbat. 1999. *Volume 78.*

Ego, Beate: Targum Scheni zu Ester. 1996. *Volume 54.*

Engel, Anja: see *Schäfer, Peter*

Frey, J.: see *Albani, M.*

Frick, Peter: Divine Providence in Philo of Alexandria. 1999. *Volume 77.*

Gibson, E. Leigh: The Jewish Manumission Inscriptions of the Bosporus Kingdom. 1999. *Volume 75.*

Gleßmer, Uwe: Einleitung in die Targume zum Pentateuch. 1995. *Volume 48.*

Goldberg, Arnold: Mystik und Theologie des rabbinischen Judentums. Gesammelte Studien I. Ed. by *M. Schlüter* and *P. Schäfer.* 1997. *Volume 61.*

– Rabbinische Texte als Gegenstand der Auslegung. Gesammelte Studien II. Ed. by *M. Schlüter* and *P. Schäfer.* 1999. *Volume 73.*

Goodblatt, David: The Monarchic Principle. 1994. *Volume 38.*

Grözinger, Karl: Musik und Gesang in der Theologie der frühen jüdischen Literatur. 1982. *Volume 3.*

Gruenwald, I., Sh. Shaked and *G.G. Stroumsa* (Ed.): Messiah and Christos. Presented to David Flusser. 1992. *Volume 32.*

Halperin, David J.: The Faces of the Chariot. 1988. *Volume 16.*

Hayman, A. Peter: Sefer Yesira. 2004. *Volume 104.*

Herrmann, Klaus (Ed.): Massekhet Hekhalot. 1994. *Volume 39.*

– see *Schäfer, Peter*

Herzer, Jens: Die Paralipomena Jeremiae. 1994. *Volume 43.*

Hezser, Catherine: Form, Function, and Historical Significance of the Rabbinic Story in Yerushalmi Neziqin. 1993. *Volume 37.*

– see *Schäfer, Peter*

– The Social Structure of the Rabbinic Movement in Roman Palestine. 1997. *Volume 66.*

Hezser, Catherine (Ed.): Rabbinic Law in its Roman and Near Eastern Context. 2003. *Volume 97.*

Hirschfelder, Ulrike: see *Schäfer, Peter*

Horbury, W.: see *Krauss, Samuel*

Houtman, Alberdina: Mishnah und Tosefta. 1996. *Volume 59.*

Ilan, Tal: Jewish Women in Greco-Roman Palestine. 1995. *Volume 44.*

– Integrating Jewish Woman into Second Temple History. 1999. *Volume 76.*

– Lexicon of Jewish Names in Late Antiquity. 2002. *Volume 91.*

Instone Brewer, David: Techniques and Assumptions in Jewish Exegesis before 70 CE. 1992. *Volume 30.*

Ipta, Kerstin: see *Schäfer, Peter*

Jacobs, Martin: Die Institution des jüdischen Patriarchen. 1995. *Volume 52.*

Kasher, Aryeh: The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt. 1985. *Volume 7.*

– Jews, Idumaeans, and Ancient Arabs. 1988. *Volume 18.*

– Jews and Hellenistic Cities in Eretz-Israel. 1990. *Volume 21.*

Knittel, Thomas: Das griechische ‚Leben Adams und Evas'. 2002. *Volume 88.*

Krauss, Samuel: The Jewish-Christian Controversy from the earliest times to 1789. Vol.I. Ed. by *W. Horbury.* 1996. *Volume 56.*

Kuhn, Peter: Offenbarungsstimmen im Antiken Judentum. 1989. *Volume 20.*
Kuyt, Annelies: The ‚Descent' to the Chariot. 1995. *Volume 45.*
Lange, A.: see *Albani, M.*
Lange, Nicholas de: Greek Jewish Texts from the Cairo Genizah. 1996. *Volume 51.*
Lehnardt, Andreas: Qaddish. 2002. *Volume 87.*
Leonhardt, Jutta: Jewish Worship in Philo of Alexandria. 2001. *Volume 84.*
Lohmann, Uta: see *Schäfer, Peter*
Loopik, M. van (Transl. a. comm.): The Ways of the Sages and the Way of the World. 1991. *Volume 26.*
Luttikhuizen, Gerard P.: The Revelation of Elchasai. 1985. *Volume 8.*
Mach, Michael: Entwicklungsstadien des jüdischen Engelglaubens in vorrabbinischer Zeit. 1992. *Volume 34.*
Mendels, Doron: The Land of Israel as a Political Concept in Hasmonean Literature. 1987. *Volume 15.*
Moscovitz, Leib: Talmudic Reasoning. 2002. *Volume 89.*
Mutius, Georg von: see *Schäfer, Peter*
Necker, Gerold: see *Schäfer, Peter*
Noy, David / Panayotov, Alexander / Bloedhorn, Hanswulf: Inscriptiones Judaicae Orientis. Volume 1: Eastern Europe. 2004. *Volume 101.*
Noy, David / Bloedhorn, Hanswulf: Inscriptiones Judaicae Orientis. Volume 3: Syria and Cyprus. 2004. *Volume 102.*
Olyan, Saul M.: A Thousand Thousands Served Him. 1993. *Volume 36.*
Otterbach, Rina: see *Schäfer, Peter*
Panayotov, Alexander: see *Noy, David*
Prigent, Pierre: Le Judaisme et l'image. 1990. *Volume 24.*
Pucci Ben Zeev, Miriam: Jewish Rights in the Roman World. 1998. *Volume 74.*
Pummer, Reinhard: Early Christian Authors on Samaritans and Samaritanism. 2002. *Volume 92.*
Reed, A. Y.: see *Becker, A. H.*
Reeg, Gottfried (Ed.): Die Geschichte von den Zehn Märtyrern. 1985. *Volume 10.*
– see *Schäfer, Peter*
Renner, Lucie: see *Schäfer, Peter*
Reichman, Ronen: Sifra und Mishna. 1998. *Volume 68.*
Rohrbacher-Sticker, Claudia: see *Schäfer, Peter*
Salvesen, A. (Ed.): Origen's Hexapla and Fragments. 1998. *Volume 58.*
Samely, Alexander: The Interpretation of Speech in the Pentateuch Targums. 1992. *Volume 27.*
Schäfer, Peter: Der Bar-Kokhba-Aufstand. 1981. *Volume 1.*
– Hekhalot-Studien. 1988. *Volume 19.*
Schäfer, Peter (Ed.): Geniza-Fragmente zur Hekhalot-Literatur. 1984. *Volume 6.*
– The Bar Kokhba War Reconsidered. 2003. *Volume 100.*
– see *Goldberg, Arnold*
– in cooperation with *Klaus Herrmann, Rina Otterbach, Gottfried Reeg, Claudia Rohrbacher-Sticker, Guido Weyer:* Konkordanz zur Hekhalot-Literatur. Band 1: 1986. *Volume 12.*
– Band 2: 1988. *Volume 13.*
Schäfer, Peter, Margarete Schlüter, Hans Georg von Mutius (Ed.): Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur. 1981. *Volume 2.*
Schäfer, Peter (Ed.) in cooperation with *Hans-Jürgen Becker, Klaus Herrmann, Ulrike Hirschfelder, Gerold Necker, Lucie Renner, Claudia Rohrbacher-Sticker, Stefan Siebers:* Übersetzung der Hekhalot-Literatur. Band 1: §§ 1–80. 1995. *Volume 46.*
– Band 2: §§ 81–334. 1987. *Volume 17.*
– Band 3: §§ 335–597. 1989. *Volume 22.*
– Band 4: §§ 598–985. 1991. *Volume 29.*
Schäfer, Peter, and *Hans-Jürgen Becker* (Ed.) in cooperation with *Anja Engel, Kerstin Ipta, Gerold Necker, Uta Lohmann, Martina Urban, Gert Wildensee:* Synopse zum Talmud Yerushalmi. Band I/1–2: 1991. *Volume 31.*
– Band I/3–5: 1992. *Volume 33.*
– Band I/6–11: 1992. *Volume 35.*
– Band III: 1998. *Volume 67.*
– Band IV: 1995. *Volume 47.*

Schäfer, Peter, and *Shaul Shaked* (Ed.): Magische Texte aus der Kairoer Geniza. Band 1: 1994. *Volume 42*
- Band 2: 1997. *Volume 64.*
- Band 3: 1999. *Volume 72.*

Schäfer, Peter (Ed.): The Talmud Yerushalmi and Graeco-Roman Culture I. 1998. *Volume 71.*
Schäfer, Peter and *Hezser, Catherine* (Ed.): The Talmud Yerushalmi and Graeco-Roman Culture II. 2000. *Volume 79.*
Schäfer, Peter (Ed.): The Talmud Yerushalmi and Graeco-Roman Culture III. 2003. *Volume 93.*
Schlüter, Margarete: see *Goldberg, Arnold*
- see *Schäfer, Peter*

Schmidt, Francis: Le Testament Grec d'Abraham. 1986. *Volume 11.*
Schröder, Bernd: Die ‚väterlichen Gesetze'. 1996. *Volume 53.*
Schwartz, Daniel R.: Agrippa I. 1990. *Volume 23.*
Schwemer, Anna Maria: Studien zu den frühjüdischen Prophetenlegenden. Vitae Prophetarum Band I: 1995. *Volume 49.*
- Band II (mit Beiheft: Synopse zu den Vitae Prophetarum): 1996. *Volume 50.*

Shahar, Yuval: Josephus Geographicus. 2004. *Volume 98.*
Shaked, Shaul: see *Gruenwald, I.*
- see *Schäfer, Peter*

Shatzman, Israel: The Armies of the Hasmonaeans and Herod. 1991. *Volume 25.*
Siebers, Stefan: see *Schäfer, Peter*
Sivertsev, Alexei: Private Households and Public Politics in 3rd – 5th Century Jewish Palestine. 2002. *Volume 90.*
Spilsbury, Paul: The Image of the Jew in Flavius Josephus' Paraphrase of the Bible. 1998. *Volume 69.*
Stroumsa, G.G.: see *Gruenwald, I.*
Stuckenbruck, Loren T.: The Book of Giants from Qumran. 1997. *Volume 63.*
Swartz, Michael D.: Mystical Prayer in Ancient Judaism. 1992. *Volume 28.*
Sysling, Harry: Tehiyyat Ha-Metim. 1996. *Volume 57.*
Urban, Martina: see *Schäfer, Peter*
Veltri, Giuseppe: Eine Tora für den König Talmai. 1994. *Volume 41.*
- Magie und Halakha. 1997. *Volume 62.*

Visotzky, Burton L.: Golden Bells and Pomegranates. 2003. *Volume 94.*
The Ways that Never Parted. 2003. *Volume 96.*
Wandrey, Irina: „Das Buch des Gewandes" und „Das Buch des Aufrechten". 2004. *Volume 96.*
Weyer, Guido: see *Schäfer, Peter*
Wewers, Gerd A.: Probleme der Bavot-Traktate. 1984. *Volume 5.*
Wildensee, Gert: see *Schäfer, Peter*
Wilson, Walter T.: The Mysteries of Rigtheousness. 1994. *Volume 40.*

For a complete catalogue please write to the publisher
Mohr Siebeck • P.O. Box 2030 • D-72010 Tübingen/Germany
Up-to-date information on the internet at www.mohr.de